Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-127
Wednesday
5 July 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-127 5 July 1989

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Marshal Akhromeyev Comments on NATO Proposals *[Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 29 Jun]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gremitskikh Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 4 Jul 2
Notes Gorbachev Visit to France *[TASS]* 2
Comments on Coup in Sudan *[TASS]* 2
Criticizes U.S. Hyde Amendment *[TASS]* 2
Rebuts INF Treaty Violation Allegations *[TASS]* 3
Discusses Austrian Decision on EEC *[TASS]* 3
Delegates to Paris Human Rights Forum Cited *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jun]* 3
USSR Attends Customs Cooperation Meeting *[TASS]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Greets Bush on Independence Day *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jul]* 5
Bush's Planned Visit to Poland Viewed *[Chernyshev on TASS]* 5
SDI Supporters Step Up Campaign in U.S. Congress *[TASS]* 5
U.S. Stages 'Provocative Actions' in Panama *[TASS]* 6
More on Souther/Orlov Suicide, Dying Wishes *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]* 6
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Feature *[Kosarev, 4 Jul]* 7

China

PRC Premier Affirms Policy of Reforms, Openness *[TASS]* 9
President Shangkun Cited on Reform Policy *[TASS]* 10
PRC To Introduce Law on Meetings, Demonstrations *[Moscow TV]* 10
Investigation of PRC Student Deaths Concluded *[TASS]* 10
Human Rights Chairman Comments on PRC Situation *[MOSCOW NEWS No 27]* 10
Commentator Discourages Breaking Ties With China *[Simonov in MOSCOW NEWS No 26]* ... 11
Foreign Ministry Deputy Receives PRC Delegation *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Message to ASEAN Meeting Cited *[TASS]* 12
Prospects for Cambodian Solution Viewed *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 13
U Nu's Potential as Mediator in Burma Examined *[Vladimirov on Moscow International]* 13

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Statement on Afghanistan *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jul]* 14
Foreign Ministry Briefs Press on Afghanistan *[Moscow Radio]* 15
Iran's Hashemi-Rafsanjani Cited on USSR Visit *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 15
USSR-Iranian Nuclear Energy Agreement Discussed *[Moscow International]* 16
Relations With Iran, Arms Sales to Iran Viewed *[Bovin on Moscow TV]* 16
Bessmertnykh Meets With Syria's Al-Assad *[TASS]* 16
USSR-Egyptian Consultations Held in Cairo *[TASS]* 17
Pakistani Intermediate-Range Missile Plans Cited *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jul]* 17

East Europe

Execution, Reburial of Hungary's Nagy Assessed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 27]* 17
Events of 1956 Examined *[Fadeyev on Moscow Radio]* 18
Polish Plenum, Jaruzelski Nomination Cited *[TASS]* 19
Zagladin on Moscow Acceptance of Solidarity *[AFP]* 19
Yazov Receives Romanian Deputy Minister *[TASS]* 19

West Europe

'Unmanned' Soviet MiG-23 Crashes in Belgium *[TASS]* 19
Yazov Provides Details *[TASS]* 20
Borsuk on Causes of Crash *[TASS]* 20
Reportage on Gorbachev's Visit to France 21
Agenda of Visit Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Gorbachev Leaves Moscow 4 Jul *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Gorbachev Arrives in Paris *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Mitterrand Welcomes Gorbachev *[TASS]* 21
Gorbachev, Mitterrand Arrival Remarks *[Moscow TV]* 22
Gorbachev, Mitterand Begin Talks *[TASS]* 22
Contents of Talks Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 23
Gorbachev Comments on Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 23
More on Gorbachev-Mitterrand Talks *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 24
Gorbachev Activities in Paris 4 Jul *[Moscow TV]* 25
Mitterrand Hosts Dinner 4 Jul *[TASS]* 25
Mitterrand Remarks at Dinner *[TASS]* 25
Gorbachev Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 26
Gorbachev Talks to Parisians *[Moscow TV]* 28
Gorbachev Tours Arc de Triomphe *[TASS]* 28
Gorbachev Meets With Chirac *[TASS]* 28
Shevardnadze, Dumas Discuss European Issues *[TASS]* 29
Shevardnadze Comments on Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Shevardnadze, Dumas Interviewed *[TASS]* 30
Yakovlev Meets With French Senate President *[TASS]* 30
Meets With Members of Senate *[Moscow TV]* 30
Ties With France Viewed on Eve of Gorbachev Trip 30
Voronin Examines Economic Ties *[TASS]* 30
Voronin Analyzes Trade Problems *[TASS]* 31
Moiseyev Views Military Relations *[TASS]* 31
Course of Military Ties Assessed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jul]* 32
'New Political Dynamism' Foreseen *[TASS]* 32
Paris Press Center Opens Prior to Gorbachev Visit *[TASS]* 33
Zagladin Speaks at Press Center *[TASS]* 33
Gerasimov Briefs Journalists *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Mitterrand Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit *[Potapov on Moscow TV]* 34
Views Changes in Europe, Prospects *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jul]* 35
Dumas Comments on Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit *[TASS]* 37
Shevardnadze Talks With French Envoy in Moscow *[TASS]* 37
North Atlantic Assembly Group Arrives in Moscow *[TASS]* 37
Ryzhkov Receives Delegation *[TASS]* 37

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

3 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported 39
Gorbachev's Introductory Remarks *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Yazov Addresses 3 Jul Session *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Yazov Answers Deputies' Questions *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Gorbachev Speech Supports Yazov *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Mostovoy Discusses Wholesale Trade *[Moscow Radio]* 51

4 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported 52
Discussion of Silayev Candidacy *[TASS]* 52
Silayev Confirmed Deputy Chairman *[Moscow Radio]* 52
Kamentsev Fails To Win Approval *[TASS]* 53
Discussion of Kamentsev Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Ryzhkov Challenges Nepotism Charge *[Moscow Radio]* 54
11 Deputy Chairmen Approved *[TASS]* 54
Systsov, Pugin, Konovalov Confirmed *[TASS]* 55
Large Majority Confirms Katushev *[TASS]* 55
Nuclear Power Issue Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Council of Ministers Appointments *[TASS]* 57
Supreme Soviet Approves Ministers *[TASS]* 58
Ryzhkov Accused of Slackness *[AFP]* 59
Deputy Asks Yeltsin To Explain *[Moscow Radio]* 59
5 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported 59
More Ministerial Appointments *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Supreme Soviet Elects New Ministers *[TASS]* 60
Konarev Rejected as Railways Minister *[TASS]* 60
Candidacy Session Continues *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Shimko, Kotlyar Confirmed Ministers *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Yazov Interviewed on Parliamentary Criticism *[Moscow International]* 61
Nishanov Interviewed on Nationalities Issue *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Gorbachev, Leaders Sign Andrey Gromyko's Obituary *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 63
Gromyko Funeral Commission Named *[Moscow TV]* 64
Gorbachev Meets With Estonian Delegates 1 Jun *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 3 Jun]* 64
Gorbachev, Others Sign Georgian Singer's Obituary *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 68
Vorotnikov Addresses Chelyabinsk Officials 1 Jul *[TASS]* 68
Resolution on Repression Victims Adopted *[TASS]* 69
Checheno-Ingush Obkom Elects New First Secretary *[Moscow TV]* 69
Biryukova Attends Medical Workers Day Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Fergana Curfew Eased; 'Extremists' Still Active *[TASS]* 69
General Describes Arms Use During Fergana Crisis *[TASS]* 70
Nagorno-Karabakh Situation 'Remains Tense' *[TASS]* 71
Georgian-Azerbaijani Tensions Noted in Georgia *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]* 71
Economist on Economic Independence in Georgia *[TASS]* 71
Independent Television Company NIKA Established *[Moscow International]* 72
Television Chairman Notes Goals *[Moscow International]* 72
Satellite Communications Receiving Station Assembled *[Moscow Radio]* 72
National Engineering Federation Founded in Moscow *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 72
Figures on Criminals' Confiscated Weapons Reported *[Moscow TV]* 73
Paper Includes Material in Kumyk Language *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Optina Hermitage Monastery Fully Restored *[TASS]* 73

Economic

Economy Should Be Geared to Human Needs *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Jun]* 74

Agricultural

Gorbachev, Ligachev Attend CPSU Food Conference *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 77
Commentary on Work of Conference *[Ruvinskiy on Moscow Radio]* 88
Colorado Beetle Rife in Kursk Oblast *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 89

Scientific

'Nadezhda' Satellite Launched 4 Jul *[TASS]* 89
Steps Taken To Coordinate Chernobyl Research *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 90

Marshal Akhromeyev Comments on NATO Proposals
AU0307164989 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 29 Jun 89 p 4

[NOVOSTI report "specially for ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI" by Vladimir Ostrovskiy: "The Discrepancy of NATO Proposals"]

[Text] In connection with the NATO proposals on conventional arms reductions, NOVOSTI presents a brief summary of an interview on this subject given to its commentator by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, adviser to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and people's deputy.

Marshal S. Akhromeyev pointed out that the NATO Council's decisions on armed forces reductions, made in Brussels on 30 May, will not be officially presented at the Vienna talks until the autumn. However, it is good that the stances of both sides have become clear and that one can assess them and hold talks. S. Akhromeyev said that to a certain extent, the stances of both sides are convergent. At last NATO has consented that air forces should be included in the talks, and has even suggested a numerical level of combat aircraft to which these forces should be reduced. There were also proposals on reducing the numerical strength of armed forces in central and Western Europe, even though they only apply to the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and United States.

We have welcomed the words of President G. Bush about NATO's intention of reaching an accord in Vienna, said S. Akhromeyev. This is a step forward.

However, NATO's proposals include many that are biased. What kind of proposals are these? If both sides want to relax the military tension in Europe by radically reducing armed forces and establishing an armed forces structure on each side that is geared solely to defense, then why is a mere 15 percent reduction in the air forces envisaged? Each side has the right to have the kind of land forces that serve defense purposes. Although NATO wants to bring about a radical reduction in the land forces of the Warsaw Pact, it does not want to reduce its air forces for the sole reason that both sides would have to reduce their combat aircraft by a considerable amount. Such a stance from partners at negotiations is unacceptable.

S. Akhromeyev recalled that the USSR and its allies have agreed not to discuss carrier-based naval air forces at the talks. At the same time, we insist that antimissile defense forces, as a purely defensive branch of the armed forces, be excluded from the talks. A missile destroyer, S. Akhromeyev continued, is only a means of battle against aerial targets, chiefly against attack air forces. Nevertheless, NATO insists on including antimissile forces in the talks, which means that it wants them to be reduced.

It seems totally incomprehensible that no numerical reduction in the armed forces of both sides in Europe is foreseen. We suggest a reduction of 1 million men on each side. NATO rejects this suggestion. How can one reduce the armaments of land forces by tens of thousands of weapons, and the strength of the air forces by thousands of aircraft, without at the same time reducing the number of personnel? Unless the personnel composition of the European armed forces of both sides is reduced, it will be possible to rebuild the armed forces and renew the threat of war on the continent, S. Akhromeyev said.

It has been suggested that the Soviet Union and United States should merely reduce the armed forces on the territory of their allies. We consider such a reduction unjustified. The forces of every country in each of the two military blocs should be reduced. Soviet forces in Poland, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, and Hungary, whereas the United States, Canada, France, Great Britain, Belgium, and the Netherlands would reduce their forces in the FRG to an identical level [sentence as published]. The presence of these states on the territory of the above-mentioned countries is a consequence of World War II, and they should all be approached in an identical way.

As we can see, there are still many differences. One can clearly see NATO's intention to reduce those Warsaw Pact armaments which exceed those of NATO, in other words, a biased reduction. Concerning those armaments in which NATO has numerical superiority, no reductions in these are foreseen. If we were to agree to such a solution, NATO would gain military superiority. Therefore, we cannot accept it.

As far as talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe are concerned, we are disappointed by the U.S. President's proposals. The American side proposes a start to these talks only after the signing of a treaty on armed forces reductions in Europe, and after a commencement of these reductions. However, we believe that it is groundless to make reductions in nuclear tactical weapons conditional on a reduction of conventional weapons. It is impossible to achieve complete security in Europe if one leaves tactical nuclear weapons outside the subject of talks.

In every country that is interested in consolidating security in Europe and the entire world, society and politicians can consider and assess the differences between the stances of NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Gremitskikh Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 4 Jul

Notes Gorbachev Visit to France

LD0407200889 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—"The new Soviet-French summit which opened in Paris today is called upon to confirm a traditional, stable development of the Soviet-French dialogue, an important element of European and international political process", Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told briefing here today.

He said the implementation of the arrangements reached in Moscow in November 1988 made it possible to prepare an impressive [words indistinct] for the signing at the current meeting. "Considerable potential of mutual understanding that accumulated in relations between the two countries [words indistinct] horizons for constructive bilateral cooperation for the benefit of peaceful future of Europe and a whole world", the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

The visit assumes special importance due to the fact that it is held shortly before the celebration of the bicentennial of the great French Revolution which is planned to be observed broadly also in the Soviet Union. In connection wih this remarkable event, a group of Soviet journalists, at the invitation of French radio listeners, will take part in an automobile run in France, Valeriy Prostakov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, Gosteleradio, told the briefing.

Yuriy Gremitskikh then touched upon the question of a regular meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states to be held in Bucharest on July 7-8. "Such conferences are always important events in international affairs. The Warsaw Treaty Organisation has of late been advancing large-scale peace initiatives, and it can be said with confidence that the up-coming meeting will not be an exception," the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

He called the attention of reporters to Mikhail Gorbachev's congratulatory telegram addressed to President George Bush on the occasion of the national holiday of the United States Independence Day. The Soviet diplomat said that the contents of the telegram shows that it is more than just a conventional congratulatory message.

On behalf of Soviet people, Gremitskikh congratulated the people of Yugoslavia on the National Day, Fighters' Day, observed on July 4.

Gremitskikh summed up as politically important the results of the recent working visit to the USSR by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of [words indistinct] Party of Germany, chairman of the Council of State of the GDR. He said similarity of views and identity of goals of the Soviet Communist Party and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany were confirmed at the meeting between Gorbachev and Honecker. The durability of versatile ties developed between the USSR and the FRG was confirmed and profound mutual interest in the successful course of perestroika in the USSR and the implementation of the course at renewal and continuity in the GDR was emphasized.

In connection with the arrival in the Soviet Union of a delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly headed by its President Patrick Duffy, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said that this visit is a new link in the East-West political dialogue.

The recent meeting in New York of President of the Republic of Cyprus Yeorios Vasiliou and leader of Cyprus Turks Rauf Denktas had a positive result, the conformation of the will of the Cyprus sides for the continuation of the dialogue between the committee aimed at achieving a compromise, the sole reasonable foundation for a political settlement on the island Gremitskikh said. The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized the importance of a more vigorous collective international support for Good Offices Mission of the United Nations secretary-general in Cyprus.

Comments on Coup in Sudan

LD0407142989 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—"The develoments that took place in Sudan on the night of June 30 are regarded in the Soviet Union as a purely internal matter of the Sudanese people," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the ministry's Information Directorate, expressed hope that the situation in that African country would soon fully normalise and stabilise.

This would enable Sudan to handle with greater results numerous problems in the way of the consolidation of its social and political forces.

"One would like to hope that Sudan will build its relations with all countries in the region on principles of good-neighbourliness and settlement of outstanding issues by peaceful means, and will maintain friendly cooperation and promote constructive dialogue with all other countries, including the Soviet Union," Gremitskikh said.

Criticizes U.S. Hyde Amendment

LD0407143389 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—Speaking at a briefing here today, Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said

that "the Soviet Union is concerned over the fact that the U.S. House of Representatives approved the Hyde Amendment permitting the CIA to secretly finance the electoral campaign of opposition parties in Nicaragua".

At the time when the Central American states are engaged in a search for ways of settling the protracted conflict, Gremitskikh said, outside powers need to display special tact and restraint not to thwart understandings reached with such difficulty by the leaders of Central American countries at their summits in Guatemala and El Salvador.

The decision taken by the U.S. legislature is a new and direct interference in Nicaraguan domestic affairs, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said. It is being done at the time when the Nicaraguan leadership is doing its best to switch the country's life to a peaceful footing, to reach national reconciliation and to carry out the process of democratisation on this basis.

Rebuts INF Treaty Violation Allegations

LD0407142589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1238 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 July (TASS)—The Soviet Union is observing strictly and without deviation all the provisions of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, said Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, at a briefing here today. He was commenting on the report by Senator Steven Symms on the first anniversary of the ratification of the treaty. This document attempts to prove that the USSR is deceiving the United States and violating the provisions of the treaty.

"The accusations made by Senator Steven Symms are pure fiction, said Yuriy Gremitskikh. So far the United States has made no official complaints whatsoever against the Soviet side over the treaty. Its implementation is proceeding successfully—and this was confirmed also in the White House statement on the occasion of the first anniversary of the agreement coming into force. According to the data, up to 1 June the Soviet Union has scrapped 51.1 percent of the total number of its intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and 44.6 percent of the launch vehicles for these missiles. In the same period the United States has scrapped 36.7 percent of its inetrmediate- and shorter-range missiles and 18.6 percent of its launch vehicles.

The underlying political reason for such statements is clear, Yuri Gremitskikh went on. It is to try to discredit the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, and in this way to hinder the work on an agreement to cut strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent. This line does not accord with the interests of the Soviet and American peoples, or the cause of disarmament and improvement of the international climate generally, he stressed.

Discusses Austrian Decision on EEC

LD0407154389 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today commented on the Austrian parliament's decision to approve proposals enabling the government to send an official request for joining the European Economic Community.

Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the ministry's information directorate, stressed that the Soviet Union understood Austria's interest in handling economic problems in relations with the EEC, that emerge in connection with the plans to create a single European market in the near future.

Gremitskikh expressed hope that in settling its relations with the EEC, the overwhelming majority of whose members are NATO countries, Austria will adopt appropriate measures to safeguard its special international status based on the 1955 state treaty and the policy of perpetual neutrality.

The Soviet spokesman recalled that both the Soviet and Austrian sides were always unanimous that preserving Austria's perpetual neutrality has been and remains its top-priority task in the field of foreign policy.

"The Soviet Union maintains that precisely this approach, meeting both national and all-European interests, preserves its importance today," Gremitskikh said.

Delegates to Paris Human Rights Forum Cited

PM0407131589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "The Paris Forum Ends Its Work"]

[Text] Paris—The first session of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the All-European Process, convened in accordance with the Vienna meeting's decisions, has ended in the French capital (two other sessions will be held in Copenhagen in 1990 and in Moscow in 1991).

Its participants, representing the 35 states which signed the Helsinki Final Act, spent 3 weeks discussing a broad range of problems of humanitarian cooperation. The meeting heard more than 30 proposals designed to give specific expression to the Vienna accords. The Soviet Union and France proposed the creation of a single legal jurisdiction [yedinoye pravovoye prostranstvo] in Europe. Furthermore, our country put forward the idea of stepping up parliaments' participation in humanitarian cooperation and elaborating a standard visa agreement and an all-European consular convention.

Your correspondent asked participants in the Paris forum to comment on its outcome.

A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister:

"Has there been an increase in the conference participants' mutual understanding as regards humanitarian problems and primarily human rights? I would not like to give the banal optimistic answer to this question. I do think, however, that the answer would be yes, though numerous differences in views and approaches still remain.

"What we have experienced hitherto has been an exchange of reproaches. But it was the Soviet Union that suggested not wasting time on mutual recriminations but striving for a real improvement in the human rights sphere. The human dimension mechanism still has to be tuned, but it is already in operation and is helping to create conditions for the practical solution of humanitarian problems. I think that comparative legislation studies constitute one of the spheres of humanitarian cooperation. We could derive considerable benefit from examining how laws are drafted, adopted, and applied. Even though at times we may feel somewhat offended by critical remarks about us, constructive criticism will help us recognize our sore spots and will be useful to us. Both we and our friends have real problems. Furthermore, it must be said that people in the West are much more skilled in making charges about human rights against us than we are in making such charges against them."

M. Van Der Stoel, head of the Netherlands delegation:

"Whereas meetings like this used to turn into venues for fierce polemics in the past, the Paris forum was of a businesslike and constructive nature. I think that our ideas of what constitutes human rights have drawn closer together. I also hope that the Soviet Union will start sharing our concept of the freedom of speech, assembly, association, and so forth."

U. Bauer [name as transliterated], head of the Canadian delegation:

"Several dozen proposals were made at the Paris meeting, and they will be examined in Copenhagen and Moscow. We recognized the tremendous progress achieved by the Soviet Union in the legislative sphere and in bringing its laws in line with the Vienna agreements. I hope that the situation regarding human rights will improve over the next few years and that, by the time of the Moscow conference, we will be able to reach broader agreement on a greater number of questions than at present. The Vienna accords will help us achieve considerable progress in humanitarian cooperation. I think that we are about to see a slow but stable process of elaborating common concepts concerning legislation, protection of human rights and ethnic minorities, and the building of bridges between states and cultures."

USSR Attends Customs Cooperation Meeting

LD0407084189 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Washington July 4—By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov:

The tasks of customs at the turn of the century and ways to enhance the coordination of their activities are among the central items on the agenda of the Customs Cooperation Council's session which opened here on Monday [3 July]. It is being attended by delegations from more than 100 member-countries and numerous observers including a Soviet delegation headed by Vitaliy Boyarov, head of the Chief Directorate of the Soviet State Customs Control at the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The customs services of all countries must do their utmost to promote world trade turnover, the council's general secretary Thomas Hays said in his opening address. With this in mind, a number of programmes involving the unification of customs documents and the introduction of a harmonized system of describing and coding commodities will be introduced. The computerization of customs services, Hays said, will permit the rapid processing of commodity movement data on a paperless basis which will, in turn, speed up trade turnover and help enhance control over the observance of customs regulations.

The enhanced role of the customs and the need for international cooperation to monitor the surging volume of world trade were discussed in their speeches at the session by William von Raab, chief of the U.S. Customs Service, and Robert Mosbacher, U.S. secretary of commerce.

On the first day of the session's work, heads of the customs services of the capitalist and socialist countries of Europe met to discuss efforts to counter drug trafficking. The head of the Soviet delegation reported the work done in this field by the Soviet Union. He invited interested countries to attend a seminar on countering illegal drug trafficking which the Soviet Union will hold under U.N. auspices in 1990, at the same time as the seminar an exhibition of technical means of customs will be mounted. The Soviet invitation was met with enthusiasm by the participants.

"One of the tasks of the Soviet delegation here is to hold talks with the leadership of the Customs Cooperation Council on the entry of the USSR into this international organization. We are very close to becoming full-fledged members of the council," Boyarov told TASS.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Greets Bush on Independence Day

PM0307154189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Gorbachev Independence Day cable to President Bush]

[Text] To His Excellency George Bush, President of the United States of America:

Mr President, please accept on the occasion of Independence Day—the national holiday of the United States—congratulations and wishes of peace and prosperity to the U.S. people.

I am convinced that the continuation and deepending of collaboration between the USSR and the United States in line with the principles of realism, equality, and mutual advantage would accord with the mood of the peoples of our countries and would assist general progress toward a new, peaceful period in international relations.

The numerous messages which we have exchanged, other contacts, and the May talks in Moscow confirm that preconditions exist for further progress in the main spheres of this collaboration. Understandably, the achievement of accords in Vienna and at the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva would be of special significance for ensuring security and eliminating the threat of war. For our part we intend to do everything in our power to ensure the success of these talks. Opportunities exist for advancing more swiftly and with better results in assisting the settlement of regional issues, in the development of bilateral ties, and on all other items on the Soviet-U.S. agenda.

I would like to reaffirm, Mr President, that the Soviet Union invariably favors improved relations with the United States.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Bush's Planned Visit to Poland Viewed

LD0407212989 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT 4 Jul 89

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS— On the eve of his visit to Poland, President of the United States George Bush gave an interview to a group of Polish journalists. Let us take into account the statement of the U.S. President that his visit does not pursue the aim of complicating the situation in Poland or damaging Poland's relations with the USSR, as well as the President's stated intention to keep from attempts to dictate to Poles how they should decide their destiny, to keep from imposing American "patterns".

There is no doubt the U.S. intention to give economic aid to Poland, proclaimed by Bush, can be welcomed. True, the question arises if things go further than words. We have all seen what problems arise in the USA, for example, about granting Hungary the most favoured nation treatment if only for a few years.

I think it should also be noted that in his interview the President of the United States mentioned more than once the future of Europe viewed as a single whole and that he is looking forward to the time when the United States will go beyond the framework of the policy of deterrence in East-West relations.

At the same time, one can hardly overlook Bush's stated wish that the Soviet Union withdraw its troops from Poland completely. He said no one thinks any longer that there is the danger of Poland's being invaded by the West, so the USSR need not feel concerned over the security of an ally. One cannot but be surprised at the fact that the question of the security of the country the U.S. President is to visit is viewed by him outside the context of a broader problem of maintaining the defence potential of the Warsaw Treaty. A natural question arises: Why shouldn't the United States for reasons similar to those mentioned by Bush withdraw its troops, say, from the FRG?

The double standard used by the head of the U.S. Administration in the given case, that is the wish that the USSR take some unilateral measures, while the United States preserves the status quo can hardly promote the further improvement of the situation in Europe. There is no doubt that mutual efforts of the sides and fully taking into consideration the interests of security of each of them are essential for this.

The Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries more than once proposed that all troops be removed from the territories of others on a basis of reciprocity, naturally. But George Bush talks as if no such proposal has been made.

The President of the United States, should, apparently be reminded also of another important proposal of the Warsaw Treaty member-states. Striving to overcome the persisting division of Europe into opposing military blocs, they declare for the simultaneous disbandment of both military-political alliances and, as an initial step, of their military organisations. Advancing to this goal, all the Warsaw Treaty countries and members of the North Atlantic Alliance could channel joint efforts for the quests of the ways of giving up military confrontation, for the development of interaction of the states regardless of their membership in some or other alliance. This is precisely the way to create Europe forming a single whole.

SDI Supporters Step Up Campaign in U.S. Congress

LD0107181389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0837 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] Washington, 1 Jul (TASS)—Former SDI director James Abrahamson held a briefing on Friday on the theme "SDI: Progress of Works and Prospects," and he

briefed members of the Congress on the implementation of the "Brilliant Pebbles" project. This program is aimed at developing small interceptor missiles, which could be deployed in the an earth orbit. For the period from 1990 to 1993, 12 tests of this technology are planned 8 of them in space.

This meeting, held on the initiative of the "Center for Peace and Freedom", is yet further evidence of the fact that the conservatively thinking organizations are stepping up their campaign of working on the legislators and trying to secure their support for the "Star Wars" program. This campaign has intensified, in particular after the research and development sub-committee of the House of Representatives Armed Forces Commitee spoke in favour of reducing the assignations for the SDI program by $1.1 billion in the next fiscal year.

The mood in Congress favorable to reducing the assignations for SDI clearly worries the administration, and it is not just by accident that U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle delivered a speech in defense of SDI at the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. Former CIA Director William Colby expressed a directly opposite viewpoint in the "Newsday." Having noted that the fate of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva hinges directly on the U.S. Administration's attitude toward SDI, Colby spoke of the necessity to drop the idea of using SDI as a "bargaining chip" at the talks. In his view the "Star Wars" program should be reduced to research work, because it could start a new arms race.

U.S. Stages 'Provocative Actions' in Panama

LD0407200189 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 4 Jul 89

["Provocative Actions by U.S. Troops in Panama"—TASS headline]

[Text] Panama July 4 TASS—A U.S. infantry battalion of the U.S. troops stationed in Panama has occupied with the support of tanks, armoured troop carriers and aircraft two small Panamanian villages of Chilibre and Gamboa in the heartland of the republic not far from the Panama Canal.

Without getting agreement from the Panamanian authorities, these settlements were chosen as a place for holding exercises. It is the second day U.S. soldiers have been carrying out mopping-up operations in the search for hypothetical terrorists. Combat aircraft screech overhead. At night fire support helicopters hovered over neighbourhoods with powerful searchlights piercing the villages. Local residents fear to come out into the street, the operation of institutions appeared to be virtually paralysed, shops and schools are closed, traffic is not running.

The new anti-Panamanian action of Washington is the most flagrant violation of the 1977 Panamanian-U.S. Treaty under which the two countries' military men should by all means get agreement on the terms and place of military exercises on the republic's territory. Besides, noteworthy is the fact that U.S. Panama-based Southern Command made a decision to "seize" the settlements exactly at the moment when tension in bilateral relations has reached its peak.

Late last week, an American unit seized and kept under its control for 24 hours a station supplying water to the capital of Panama, Carlos Orilla, director of the Panamanian state water supply company, said. He told journalists that 300 American soldiers with full combat equipment landed by helicopters on the water supply station in Chilibre Sunday, 45 kilometres north-east of the city of Panama. They carried out a search at the station for a whole day and left it only on Monday morning. The station is now guarded by military men from the country's national defence forces. The government intended to present an official (?protest against) this move, he said.

More on Souther/Orlov Suicide, Dying Wishes

PM0307154589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 6

[R. Ignatyev report: "At the USSR KGB: A Soviet Intelligence Officer's Last Hours"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA (No 180) talked about the fate of the Soviet intelligence officer KGB Major Mikhail Yevgenyevich Orlov (Glenn Michael Souther), who died in his prime at the age of 32. In view of readers' requests, the USSR KGB has informed us of the circumstances of M. Orlov's death.

It happened on the night of 22 June 1989. At home in his dacha, M. Orlov wrote a number of suicide notes: to his mother, wife and daughter, friends, and colleagues. Then he went to the garage in the grounds of the dacha. He started up his "Zhiguli" there, closed the garage doors, and lay down on the back seat. Carbon monoxide began to enter the automobile through the half-open doors...

When Orlov did not come out to the official car to go to work the next morning it became clear that something was wrong... He was found dead in his car. The motor was still warm. Burdenko Hospital specialists conducted an autopsy. They stated that death had occurred as a result of carbon monoxide poisoning.

According to KGB personnel he was a big-hearted man, a romantic, who was very impressionable and easily hurt. He was at the same time strong and brave, a man of supreme professionalism. As a major intelligence officer, Mikhail Orlov was constantly under stress and totally exhausted. But who can tell a man's breaking point? His nerves gave out...

Mikhail Orlov did not like causing people pain. He wrote in his suicide note to his colleagues: "...Justice requires that you hear my last words. I do not regret our relations. Our relations were long-lasting and they helped me to grow as an individual. I want to be buried in my KGB officer's uniform."

Mikhail Orlov was prepared for his funeral to be private if circumstances required. But they did not, and he was buried with full honors.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Feature

PM0407112189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Feature by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev about Michael Glenn Souther: "A Brief, Brilliant Life"; first two paragraphs are KRASNAYA ZVEZDA boxed introduction]

[Text] **A few days ago KRASNAYA ZVEZDA published an obituary in connection with the sudden death of Mikhail Yevgenyevich Orlov (Glenn Michael Souther—that is his real name), a Soviet intelligence officer and KGB staffer. It noted that he had devoted his entire life to the struggle to avert the threat of a nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind and that for a long period he had carried out crucial special tasks, making a great contribution to ensuring the state security of the Soviet Union.**

Our correspondent met with Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, and asked him to help him get in touch with people who could tell him about Orlov.

We will give the floor to eyewitnesses and participants in events in which he, KGB Major Mikhail Orlov, Glenn Souther in the past, played a far from insignificant role, and we will let the documents speak.

FROM A PERSONAL DATA SHEET: Born 1957. Place of birth Hammond, Indiana, United States. Graduated from "Old Dominion" University, Norfolk, Virginia. Did military service on the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier "Nimitz," U.S. 6th Fleet, as a military photographer in an intelligence subunit, and also on the staff ships "Albany" and "Puget Sound." Was the personal photographer of the commander of the 6th Fleet and public relations and press agent. Subsequently he served at a U.S. naval base.

What made Glenn Souther, having finished school and entered university, quit university and reject his parents' care and affection? Most probably it was a heightened sense of justice—that very feeling which subsequently was to determine many of his steps and actions, steps of vital importance for his life. He grew up in an ordinary U.S. family of average income and was brought up in the somewhat religious spirit traditional in those parts. His father was a businessman, his mother a housewife at that time. He had a brother and a sister. He was an impressionable youth, too vulnerable, probably. Then came the moment when he grew disillusioned with the church—witnessing in a specific episode the divergence between its words and its actions. However, his inner need for justice remained. Not just at a personal level, in relations with his friends and family, but in a broader sense. He wanted people to live good lives, to be happy. It was also his heightened sense of justice which made him leave university and start earning his keep rather than be a burden to his parents.

He had an interest in photography and enrolled at the military photographers school. He graduated and was assigned to the "Nimitz" to do his service. He observed, analyzed, and tried to interpret what was going on around him, why there was so much nuclear death aboard an aircraft carrier plying foreign seas which, according to Souther's words, was loaded up to the deck itself with nuclear warheads. He saw that everything was geared to war, to the destruction of people, of a country about which neither he nor his fellow servicemen had much idea apart from that which propaganda tried to ram down their throats. This did not accord with his concept of justice either, it led to his inner conversion and ultimately to the step he took.

Incidentally, by that time he already knew something about the country on which the U.S. nuclear charges were trained. He liked Russian literature, especially Mayakovskiy, and even started to study the Russian language, which, naturally, to some extent broadened his horizon. Nonetheless, it will be more correct to say that his knowledge at that time did not go beyond the general notions which many Americans have about us. However, it seems that even that was sufficient to make the choice. He approached us, approached us consciously, out of conviction, he came and said that he saw nothing in his own environment worth living for, that he saw none of the justice he was inwardly seeking, and that he was ready to help us avert the worst.

A question to my interlocutor: Can you tell me where and when this happened, how he joined our intelligence service. How it all came about?

"I will only say that it was not easy, but that he found a very clever way of implementing his plan. When a person is seeking contact with an intelligence service and offering his services, this usually evokes suspicion. All sorts of things happen, even provocations. Souther was not trusted straightaway either. He had to prove his sincerity, he had to prove he was the man he claimed to be. He did this relatively quickly, he proved it by his work. From that moment onward he collaborated for a long time with the Soviet intelligence service.

On completing his service with the 6th Fleet, he returned to the United States and studied at the University of Norfolk Military Studies Faculty—that is where the Navy sends promising people. At the same time he

worked at the largest base—a top secret U.S. Naval intelligence center, working on the interpretation of space intelligence photographic material.

FROM A WASHINGTON POST NEWS REPORT: "The latest 'Indigo-Lacross' surveillance satellites can instantaneously transmit to the CIA photographs taken at any time of day or night, in any weather. The main observation objective of the 'Vortex' satellites will be Soviet experiments with nuclear technology, a sphere where, according to serious fears in the United States, Moscow could accomplish a breakthrough in the frenzied race for space weapons designed to destroy enemy missiles in flight."

During the years of his cooperation with our intelligence Glenn Souther used numerous pseudonyms. Toward the end he worked under the codename "Ugo" [as transliterated]. "Ugo's" interests focused on information about plans to employ the U.S. Navy in a nuclear war against the USSR, the Navy's nuclear weapons, the activity of nuclear-powered and nuclear-armed submarines, and the possibility of these weapons being used in the event of a conflict developing. There is no need to talk about the great importance of this data for coordinating the efforts of Soviet military personnel and politicians, for the elaboration of the correct defense strategy, and for the preservation of peace on earth. He had access to top secret documents and often attended the command's operational conferences.

Yes, peace is not easy to achieve. It is for peace's sake that people like Glenn Souther are prepared to sacrifice their lives. And they do. People can discuss the ethical aspect of their profession as much as they like. But, the way our world is organized, it is impossible to manage without intelligence for the time being. It is necessary to eliminate the threat of war, to neutralize perfidious plans, and to ensure that we lead a calm life.

Glenn sensed danger back in the summer of 1986, when he was summoned to an FBI department. As a matter of fact, in itself this summons proved nothing. Had something serious been at stake, things would have gone beyond a mere summons. Nonetheless, the questions put him on his guard—why was he so interested in Russia, in Soviet poetry and music. As a matter of fact, he made no secret of these interests, bought books about Mayakovskiy, read his poems and even successfully recited them at a poetry recital competition in the university, and wrote papers about the poet. While at the FBI he had a conversation during which he was told that there were suspicions of his being involved in prohibited activity. We realize that this is absurd, an FBI staffer politely told him, but nonetheless we have to formally close this investigation, and this would require an additional test on the "polygraph"—the "lie detector."

Glenn had already undergone such a test when he was given access to top secret material. But this proved insufficient, and he had to submit to the test again. Even though "Ugo" believed that the danger was not great, he notified the Center about it. A thorough analysis showed that the threat was real and he could not remain any longer in the United States.

To start with, Glenn Souther did not get in touch with anyone, he remained incognito. Why? He felt very acutely the break with his relatives and friends. And he believed that it would be better for them if he were to simply disappear from their lives once and for all—as if he had died—and that this story would be gradually forgotten. But this was unfortunately not to be. An investigation into his disappearance was launched in the United States, he was tried in his absence, and the press created a sensation. And Glenn drew the conclusion that, under the circumstances, it would be simpler, more correct, and more honest to say where he was and what had happened to him.

"TO THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM. I, Glenn Michael Souther, apply for Soviet citizenship for the following political and personal reasons:

"First, having served 10 years in the U.S. Navy, I declare with the utmost responsibility that the U.S. Government will never do anything from sincere and honest considerations to establish peace on earth until such time as it is firmly convinced of its military superiority. It is not interested in the existence of a balance of power either with the USSR or with any other country....

"The second political consideration which prompted me to break with America and apply for Soviet citizenship is the fact that the United States has a scornful attitude toward the destinies of other peoples....

"All my close friends can confirm that I love Mayakovskiy very much. I hope the day will come when I shall be able to read his 'Verses on a Soviet Passport' and fully apply them to myself.

"Signed, 26 August 1986."

Souther's request was granted, and he was given Soviet citizenship. And "Ugo"—Glenn Michael Souther—became Mikhail Orlov. A few days after this was reported in the press, the U.S. Embassy approached the USSR Foreign Ministry with a request to be given an opportunity to meet with Souther. When he was told about it, he replied: "Please, I am ready." At that meeting he confirmed to the Americans that all his actions were deliberate and voluntary.

He was helped to set himself up and to find work that suited him—at his wish he was enrolled in the KGB and became an officer. He did a lot of writing, engaged in research work, and had an idea for a book—there was already an agreement with the publishing house. As always, he was working to the limit of his potential,

utterly dedicated. His personal life was gradually established. He met a young women. They were working together. They fell in love and started a family. He adored his year-old daughter Aleksandra.

It would not be at all honest to say that he accepted our life totally. Orlov was an utter realist and he could see all our difficulties and problems. There was a great deal he did not like—those lines outside the stores, and, like us, he was upset about it.

Last year his mother arrived, and you can imagine her happiness when she met with her son. He did not tell her everything about himself, about his work. He was not entitled to. And she was a smart lady. She did not ask any unnecessary questions. She knew she would go home and that they would try to get it all out of her. That indeed is what happened.

Instead of diminishing, the tiredness grew, on top of the old fatigue. The life of a major intelligence agent always involves colossal stress. Worrying letters came from the States. The FBI was still badgering his family and that worried him, too. Ronald Kessler [name as transliterated], a writer, was pestering him with letters. He said he was writing a book about him—a Russian spy. Mikhail Orlov could imagine what kind of book it would be, how much he would be vilified.

His friends noticed he was becoming short-tempered, that he would occasionally be overcome by waves of depression. They tried to distract him, help him. But he made the decision. He carried it out on the night of 21-22 June at his dacha near Moscow, bringing his life to an end.

From a letter he left for his colleagues and friends: "I do not regret our relationships. Our relationships lasted for a long time and they helped me grow as a person... I hope that you, as always in the past, will forgive me for deciding not to enter into this final battle." In the letter he asked to be buried in his KGB officer's uniform. Not knowing whether it was possible, he added: "If it means that the coffin has to be closed, then so be it."

He was buried, as is the custom, with full military honors. Hundreds and hundreds of Soviet people came to pay tribute to him.

But what was it that made him give it all up? I asked one of Mikhail Orlov's colleagues, a friend of his, about this.

"There is no single specific reason. It was more a tragic combination of circumstances. And there was obviously another factor. Mayakovskiy was always his idol, his ideal—not a formal ideal, but one of attitude. He was more intensely affected than anyone else by his poetry and his life. He was present in all things, including death. It was like fate."

A great deal is being written about Orlov-Souther in the Western press at the moment. There are various explanations of what prompted hom to cooperate with Soviet intelligence. Some try to portray him as a failure in life and in work—that was the reason, they say. But there is much to demonstrate that he was an excellent specialist. I have before me a unique document. On U.S. Navy notepaper one reads: "From the commander of the 'Nimitz' to Glenn M. Souther. Letter of thanks.

"1. Readdress and forward.

"2. As commander of a ship it is always a pleasure to receive news praising members of the crew. Your highly professional actions and assistance to VA-35 during the recent deployment in the Mediterranean were highly rated.

"Richard T. Gaskill."

Mikhail Orlov was an intelligence agent of a very high class. He is thus regarded not only by us but by those in the West who actually know what he was. When the truth about him was announced efforts were made in the United States to analyze how much he had been able to accomplish. The following admission appeared in the U.S. press: "It is very difficult, if at all possible, to assess the damage he might have caused and has caused by his activities."

He was a USSR KGB major. Mikhail Orlov was one of the galaxy of outstanding Soviet intelligence agents who lived such a brief, but brilliant life.

China

PRC Premier Affirms Policy of Reforms, Openness

LD0407105789 Moscow TASS in English 1007 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Beijing July 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kashirov

Speaking at a meeting with prominent Japanese economist I. Miyazaki, Chinese Premier Li Peng said that if Chinese people want to build a really strong and blossoming country, they should improve socialist practices and work out a correct policy, proceeding from their own realities.

China, a developing country with a huge population and relatively limited natural resources, should advance along the socialist road, Li said.

China is now integrating the planned economy and market influences, he pointed out. The implementation of reforms based on this principle has brought great benefits to the Chinese people. The policy of reforms and openness to the outside world has proved its advantages, and this policy will remain intact.

The head of the Chinese Government said in conclusion that the political situation in China is stable and that the leadership is united.

President Shangkun Cited on Reform Policy
LD0307130989 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Beijing July 3 TASS—China will strictly abide by the policy of reform and openness and independent peace-oriented foreign policy, without becoming associated with any power or blocs, China's President Yang Shangkun said at a meeting with Guyana's parliamentary delegation here on Monday.

On recent events in China, the Chinese leader said that "Chinese problems should be solved by China itself."

Some Western countries, he said, are exerting pressure on China by making what he described as "hasty and short-sighted" steps. "Later, they will understand China and change their attitude," Yang Shangkun said.

He pointed out that China should rely on itself in the process of development and that it is fully determined to overcome the difficulties facing it.

PRC To Introduce Law on Meetings, Demonstrations
OW2806144689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1040 GMT 28 Jun 89

[From the "World Today" program presented by Dmitriy Biryukov]

[Text] A PRC draft law on meetings, street processions, and demonstrations was discussed and adopted in principle at a Beijing session of the PRC State Council which was chaired by Li Peng, head of the Chinese Government. This draft law, after introduction of amendments, will be presented for the consideration and approval by the Standing Committee of the PRC National People's Council of the Seventh Convocation.

This draft law was discussed for the first time at the 30 March session of the Chinese Government. Then, relevant departments acquainted themselves with this document and made their judgement.

Liu Yunlin, PRC minister of Public Security [name and title as heard], noted that the new law will correspond to the PRC Constitution and is called to guarantee the rights of citizens to hold meetings, processions, and demonstrations on the base of preservation of public order and social stability, so as to guarantee the successful implementation of socialist construction.

Investigation of PRC Student Deaths Concluded
LD0307185989 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Beijing July 3 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Vyacheslav Tomilin:

The official investigation into the deaths of 36 Beijing students killed during the June events in the Chinese capital has been concluded.

None of the 36 students who died when the counterrevolutionary revolt was put down in Beijing was killed in Tiananmen Square, a spokesman for the City Council's Higher Education Department said in a statement published by the RENMIN RIBAO newspaper.

Most were killed because they ignored urgent orders issued by the military headquarters monitoring the imposition of martial law and municipal authorities, did not heed advice of their teachers, tutors and parents and headed for districts where turmoil took place, he said. Some died because they took part in the turmoil (this is confirmed by papers found on the killed students linking them to "squads of death fighters" and "picketing units" of the illegal Independent Union of University Students).

Several students were killed by mistake, the statement said.

Municipal authorities set up special commissions to investigate the deaths and organise burial ceremonies in cooperation with their relatives, the newspaper said.

Human Rights Chairman Comments on PRC Situation
PM0407142089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 27, 2 Jul 89 p 6

[Interview with Public Commission on Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights Chairman Fedor Burlatskiy by Yuriy Bandura: "Chinese Variant: Causes and Results"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is an editorial introduction]

[Text] Developments in China continue to attract world attention. People's Deputy of the USSR Fedor Burlatskiy, chairman of the Public Commission on Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, shares his thoughts about the current situation in China and his assessment of what's going on in that country. MN: You have been closely following China for decades. Now general attention is concentrated on the dramatic events in Beijing and the country at large. They have given rise to a lot of controversy. What is your assessment of the causes of what has happened there, particularly of what is called, in the decisions of the recent plenary meeting of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, "anti-party and anti-socialist disturbances"?

F.B.: Generally speaking, as I see it, the cause of the events is the asymmetry in China's economic and political reforms. This country was characteristic of deep economic transformations, primarily in agriculture and industry. The food supply problem has been mainly solved and living standards have risen. The open-doors policy and the drive to modernize the national economy have unquestionably scored a certain success.

Yet, certain actual and increasing differences of social interests must, of necessity, be projected onto the political sphere. The issue of socialist pluralism has become more urgent. The 13th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party adopted several important decisions concerning the political reform, especially those dealing with the issue of redistribution of power, functions and authority wielded by the party and the state. Yet, those decisions have never been implemented. This, in my opinion, was the rock-bottom cause of the internal unrest which found a vent in the protest actions of students and other youth groups.

There were specific causes as well: concerns about getting jobs after leaving from higher schools (a problem due to the serious economic difficulties in China), family issues, and problems involved in the expression of public opinion. The rallies and demonstrations ended in a political explosion aimed at widening the reforms but which in fact was fairly capable of hindering them.

MN: What do you think about the measures the authorities took against the protestors?

F.B.: I'm against using armed force to stifle internal unrest in principle, be it in our country of anywhere abroad. The mission of the army is different. I find it difficult to assess the real need for its use in the latest events in China, but I view the use of the armed force to this end as something regretful. We know from our own experience of the Tbilisi events that such actions can have tragic consequences and be vastly detrimental to the Army's image.

MN: What do you think about the recent executions in China? F.B.: As the Chairman of the Public Commission on Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, I have more than once spoken out against the use of capital punishment as such. I know well about what people think here in the Soviet Union. As far as I can see, the Soviet people's general frame of mind is identical to that of the majority of the people in the USA and other Western countries: The majority favour the use of capital punishment in retaliation for certain crimes like manslaughter. Perhaps (though I cannot be sure about this), the public's attitude towards capital punishment is the same in China. And this has to be taken into account. Yet, capital punishment shouldn't be used against political prisoners under any circumstances. The Soviet experience of the 1930s proves that the use of capital punishment for political crimes once started can turn out be very difficult to rein in. I reiterate that I'm against the use of capital punishment for politically motivated crimes, no matter what country they occur in.

Commentator Discourages Breaking Ties With China
PM3006130489 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 26, 25 Jun 89 p 3

[Vladimir Simonov commentary: "Should We Recall Our Ambassador From Beijing?"]

[Text] Volumes of Gorbachev and Kafka next to each one on sizzling asphalt. A girl in a miniskirt throws her head up to the sky, she listens to music through earphones. The 200 participants in the student hunger strike were not depriving themselves of spiritual food. Around them Tiananmen Square was swirling in demonstrations, the crackle of loudspeakers, and the fraternizing of workers and soldiers.

I was there some two weeks before the tragedy. No, one didn't feel its presence in the air. When the youth of China, changing blue jackets for blue jeans, demanded a dialogue with the government about how to accelerate democratization, to put an end to the censorship of the press, and to reform education, nothing forecast a clash. On the contrary, the highest officials stressed that the aims of the students and the authorities were reconcilable.

The morning of June 4 drowned this idea in blood.

Future historians perhaps will explain this strange transformation of the student movement into - to put it into the language of the Chinese press - "a counterrevolutionary mutiny of an extremely small number of reactionary elements who hate the Communist Party and the socialist system." They will tell us how many dead people were left on Beijing's asphalt that day. Today we'll speak of something else. Even though the tanks have left the square and Beijing is coming to its senses, the events in China are still troubling the West. One of the latest signs of protest is by the EEC Council of Minsters, who dosen't see how it is possible, in the present situation, to keep up normal relations with the PRC. Some people insist that what had happened should be discussed at the UN Security Council.

However, caution is appearing ever more frequently from behind the emotions. Washington only grumbled a bit when the Voice of America and Associated Press correspondents were expelled from China the other day. There were no retaliatory measures. James Baker, US Secretary of State, gave his due to the Chinese authorities for their "considerable reticence". There was violence "on both sides", he added. Another top man in the US Administration says the following: "We should maintain relations with a country which has over one billion people. We cannot undermine 17 years of diplomacy because of one weekend."

In short, not a single Western capital has sharply worsened its relations with Beijing.

In the meantime, Moscow, for some reason, is asked to do precisely that. More and more voices are proposing that the Soviet leadership express its disapproval by an extreme diplomatic measure - the recall of Ambassador Oleg Troyanovskiy from Beijing.

At the same time, the projection of the events in the PRC onto the USSR is also getting fashionable. On June 4 it was allegedly proved in Tiananmen that democracy is naturally incompatible with socialism, no matter how much socialism, wishes to renew itself with all sorts of "four modernizations" or perestroika. And if so, then where's the guarantee against tanks in Red Square - and not only during a parade? If China "turned back" can we be sure that the USSR will march forward?

Mikhail Gorbachev already warned against such comparisons when he was in West Germany. He had the support of the recent experience of the first Soviet parliament. The pluralism of the Congress of People's Deputies, which was transmitted live on TV, was sometimes sharp to the point of rudeness. But each clash of opinions brought unity around the idea of perestroika. The country won't accept a turning back.

By the way, looking back are precisely those who are trying to make "Moscow take a tough stand". In these conditions, this would be a form of pressure on China which contradicts the new thinking. The maybe sincere but naive critics are pining for the policy of force. Because the Chinese people today need precisely non-interference in the highest measure. We should consider everything that happened in light of this, and not allow the tragedy to stop society's movement towards modernization.

And the hypothetical recall of Troyanovskiy from Beijing would have one rather precisely forecast consequence - it would restore the source of tensions in the Far East. The states of the Asian-Pacific region that sighed with relief after the recent Soviet-Chinese summit would again get their old headache back.

This must not be allowed. Mikhail Gorabachev realizes that well. It was he who said in Beijing in May words to the effect that, unfortunately, it is still simpler to spoil and break relations among countries than to build them up, and make them more fruitful.

Foreign Ministry Deputy Receives PRC Delegation
PM3006102989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.M. Nikiforov received on 26 June a delegation of senior officials from the PRC Foreign Ministry and Diplomatic Academy, which is visiting Moscow. PRC Ambassador to the USSR Yu Hongliang took part in the friendly conversation.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Message to ASEAN Meeting Cited
LD0407213689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1339 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jul (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign affairs minister, has sent a message to the chairman of the 22nd conference of the ministers of foreign affairs of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. It says:

"Esteemed mister chairman.

"Allow me to greet you and all your colleagues from the member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations in connection with holding the 22nd conference of ASEAN ministers of foreign affairs and also to with its participants further success in implementing the policy of the association towards economic, social, and cultural progress.

"Your meeting is taking place at a crucial time for the whole world community and for the Asian and Pacific Ocean peoples. As throughout the world, a process of renewal, renunciation of yesterday's ways and means, assertion of the principles of the new political thinking, and building up a new culture of dialogue and interstate relations is gaining strength increasingly surely. The process of improvement of the political atmosphere in the region, improvement in relations between Asian and Pacific states, and elimination of conflict situations, including in Southeast Asia, where persistent efforts and good will have succeeded in opening up a realistic route to Cambodian settlement, cannot fail to give rise to satisfaction.

"It is unthinkable that the positive trends could be reinforced and developed without further progress in formulating measures which are as effective as possible to curb the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, which continues to give rise to legitimate concern on the part of the states in the Asia-Pacific region. We feel solidarity with ASEAN's view of the urgent need to set up effective cooperation between all countries and peoples on real disarmament, which, in part, would make it possible for resources to be released for development.

"It is precisely to these ends that the Soviet program of action in respect to Asia and the Pacific is subordinate, being well known as the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives. In our view the specific proposals in this program for the reduction of the level of military confrontation, including its nuclear component, fully serve the interests of peace and security of the Asian and Pacific powers and, should they be implemented, could push back the nuclear threat considerably.

"There is no doubt that the main responsibility for progress on nuclear disarmament lies with the nuclear powers. Our plans and practical affairs, be they the concept of ridding mankind of nuclear weapons by 2000, destroying intermediate and shorter-range missiles, the talks on reaching agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear arsenals, or the unilateral measures announced by M.S. Gorbachev during his recent visit to the PRC on the reduction of weapons in the Far East, are graphic evidence that the USSR is not only not absolving itself of this responsibility, it is actively seeking the elimination of the nuclear threat from the lives of mankind.

"However, the fact that the nonnuclear powers also have considerable opportunities to advance the process of disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, is indisputable. We see their considerable positive potential in the efforts directed toward creating nuclear weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. It would be no exaggeration to say that nuclear-free zones are one important measure to reduce the threat of nuclear war, [words indistinct], strengthen the regime for nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and create a climate of trust and security at regional level.

"The USSR reaffirms its positive attitude to the aspiration of ASEAN and other countries in the region to establish a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. We drew attention to the accord expressed by the participants in the 21st conference of ASEAN Ministers of Foreign Affairs to hold individual or collective consultations, including with the nuclear powers, on the principal elements of the concept of such a zone and would be prepared to start such consultations.

"The USSR accords great significance to establishing broad, equitable, and mutually beneficial cooperation between all Asian and Pacific states. This is a sure road to affirming trust and mutual understanding between peoples. In this connection we confirm our readiness to establish a mutually advantageous, constructive dialogue with ASEAN."

Prospects for Cambodian Solution Viewed

BK3006142189 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Commentary by Alek Alekseyev]

[Text] Some international political circles still seem to be pessimistic about the prospects of solving the Cambodian conflict. At one end, the process to find a solution is already in its final phase.

I will not attempt to suggest that a solution is already in the bag, but those who think that things will be normalized soon also do not have anything in common with those holding extreme views. The current situation is in favor of the process. What is the evidence? I would like to talk about a principle which, in my view, has special significance.

Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the State of Cambodia's Council of Ministers, and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk agreed on 2 May in Jakarta to end military aid to the warring Cambodian factions. One should note the significance of this event. In fact, this rules out the possibility of the Pol Pot Khmer Rouge group setting up a genocidal regime again in Cambodia. Phnom Penh has many times said that the end of military aid to the warring Cambodian parties has been an important principle in the search for a solution. Cambodia's clear stand has received support not only from opposing Cambodian circles but also from large segments of the international community. What is most important is that China has also supported this position. During his trip to China, Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev said the Soviet Union and China affirmed that as part of the measures to pull out Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, concerned countries should reduce and eventually stop military aid to the warring parties. Many other countries, particularly those in Western Europe, are in favor of ending military assistance to the warring factions.

I would like to stress Thailand's attitude. Recently, Thailand also agreed with this view. However, people know that so far, this country's territory is still used as a channel to supply weapons to opposing Cambodian groups. Currently, there are still people who have a wrong understanding. Contrary to the view supported by the world, the U.S. Administration is still waiting for the approval of Congress to provide weapons to the groups of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk and Son Sann. Phnom Penh considers the attitude of the U.S. Administration irresponsible. Phnom Penh has affirmed that this is the same as wanting to maintain instability in Cambodia. People think that Washington might dare to trample on international public opinion. Opposing Cambodian groups will certainly make the situation worse if they receive U.S. weapons. All Vietnamese combatants will be withdrawn from Cambodia on 30 September.

Two other events should be noted. First is the forthcoming meeting of warring Cambodian parties planned for 23-24 July; and the second, the international conference on the Cambodian problem to be held in early August.

The Cambodian people, like those who are waiting for a solution, will pin their hopes on these events.

U Nu's Potential as Mediator in Burma Examined

BK0407134189 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "Burma's Internal Situation and U Nu's Comments"]

[Text] At a press conference held in Yangon [Rangoon] following the tour of Upper Burma, the former prime minister of Myanma [Burma], U Nu, said he believed the

military government would hold free and fair democratic elections as promised. Our station correspondent, Aleksandr Vladimirov, makes the following observations:

Although U Nu did hint that the human rights situation in Myanma was not very satisfactory, he hoped that democratic rights would be restored to the Myanma people. U Nu said that his party has written a letter to the military authorities proposing the lifting of restrictions at least 3 months before the elections. He said his nationwide tour was very successful.

U Nu said that people who attended the mass meetings conducted by his party, the League for Democracy and Peace, believed that democracy is as essential to people as having daily meals. He added that at the same time, the people wished to see a strong defense force in the country.

Compared to the speeches of other political leaders, the general theme of U Nu's statements was very nonconfrontational. While the leaders of student movements and the National League for Democracy have been demanding the immediate implementation of freedom of expression and the right to assemble as well as to put an immediate halt to the arrests of people, U Nu's approach has been more conciliatory.

U Nu compared the military leaders to angry mothers beating their crying children relentlessly without actually trying to find out why the children are crying. U Nu said the government should not resort to force every time somebody criticizes it. U Nu made these comments at a time when the State Law and Order Restoration Council was threatening to take decisive action against all those creating disturbances.

The question to raise at this point is: Was U Nu making the guarded statements as a politician, or was he saying them as a farsighted elderly person who understands how trying it is to govern the Myanma nation in such difficult times? At one stage, U Nu was accused of trying to reach an understanding with the government, but as a former prime minister, U Nu has his own view on the problem that exists between the people's power and the military power.

As everyone knows, U Nu was deposed by the military in 1962. At the same time, we cannot forget the 1958-60 period when U Nu personally had invited the military to take over the country to supervise the holding of free and fair elections. The military was not able to resolve all the existing problems in Myanma then; it did however hold general elections as promised.

Although history is said to repeat itself, it is also said that there are no identical events in history. This does not mean that we should not draw lessons from history. If we look at the history of Myanma, we can see that every time political forces striving for the betterment of the people become deeply divided, the country gets into trouble.

Whatever his feelings about General Saw Maung's government, an ordinary Myanma citizen does not want to see the unity of the country disintegrate because of differing attitudes toward the Defense Forces. We can see differences being bridged—either overtly or covertly—in Myanma. Observing from afar, it appears that U Nu can also feel such a development taking shape in the political life of Myanma. It is believed that at a time when the prevailing tense situation could explode in the country, any leader who could reduce that tension would get the full support of the people. Certainly, that person would be better off than the others in the election.

It will be difficult to guess how successful U Nu and his League for Democracy and Peace will be in their efforts to achieve this goal. U Nu himself has said that he will not run in the upcoming elections. However, we cannot disregard the possibility that a mediator would be needed to mediate between the political forces in the country. Perhaps, U Nu, who is very well versed in politics, may be preparing himself for that very role.

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Statement on Afghanistan

PM0407152989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

["Statement by USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Spokesman": "Afghanistan: Opposition Undertakes New Adventure"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Recently it was as though rather different sentiments had started to appear in various circles in Pakistan and the United States, making it possible to hope that a realistic approach toward the situation in Afghanistan would gradually prevail. From time to time voices were heard there talking of the need to eliminate the grave regional conflict by political means. The impression was formed that this could be followed by some actions or other in the direction of the search for peaceful ways of restoring calm and stability in Afghanistan and the region. But this impression was obviously deceptive. Reports are coming in about how the Afghan opposition with the support and direct aid of Pakistan and the United States is undertaking a new adventure—preparing a "general offensive" against a number of Afghan cities. That such plans really do exist is confirmed by the fact that missile bombardments, including bombardments of Kabul, are again being increased. On 2 July a rocket projectile exploded in the immediate vicinity of the territory of the USSR Embassy in Kabul. Only through sheer chance was no Soviet citizen injured.

The statement made by U.S. representative P. Thomsen attached to the so-called "transitional Afghan government" to the effect that the United States intends to render support to this "government" as far as possible cannot fail to attract attention either. In general the coincidence in time of the signals regarding the "general offensive" that is being prepared and Thomsen's arrival in Islamabad put us on our guard.

Those who think in military strong-arm and inflammatory terms, those who put their own ambitions above the interests of the country, must reckon with the irrefutable facts. The Afghan Army has shown that it can withstand any enemy onslaught. The atmosphere which is taking shape in Kabul and the majority of provinces attests to the fact that the population supports the course toward national conciliation steered by the legitimate government. An increasing number of Afghans link the continuation of the bloodshed in Afghanistan since the withdrawal from Afghanistan of the Soviet military contingent with the irresponsible behavior of the opposition groupings which want nothing to do with the peoples' sufferings and which are obsessed with a single desire—to seize power come what may. Pakistan's support for the opposition forces and its interference, in this way, in internal Afghan affairs are interpreted by the Afghans as an encroachment on their country's sovereignty and independence.

Inflating tension in Afghanistan and the region and stepping up confrontation under conditions where a real opportunity is being opened up for ending it can bring only new casualties without resolving any problems, either domestic or external. As for the hostile actions against Soviet citizens and the Soviet Embassy in Afghanistan, it is essential once again to issue a most serious warning that such actions will not remain unpunished.

Instead of preparing a military offensive it is necessary to think at last of the specific real peaceful steps with which the opposition could respond to the government's call for national consensus.

Those who are still counting on the possibility of overthrowing the legitimate government of the Republic of Afghanistan should analyze the situation once again with a consideration for the fact that this government has and will have everything necessary to defend the independence of its country, to rebuff military onslaughts, and to satisfy its people's main need—achieving peace.

Foreign Ministry Briefs Press on Afghanistan

LD0107044989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] A briefing on current issues of international politics took place at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center on 30 June. Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, briefed Soviet and foreign journalists on the situation in Afghanistan:

[Begin Gremitskikh recording] A comparatively stable situation is being maintained in Afghanistan just now. The republic's Armed Forces are firmly holding their positions, inflicting missile, bombing-and-strafing, and artillery strikes on the opponent. On 28 and 29 June, Pakistani mercenaries carried out massive bombardment of government forces' security posts, population centers in Nangarhar Province, and residential areas of Jalalabad. Thirteen civilians were killed and 20 were injured in Jalalabad on 29 June in the bombardment.

In response to the address by Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan, to military commanders and the appeal from the Loya Jerga held in May this year, a large group of rebels, numbering 300 men, has come over to the side of the government forces in Parvan Province.

On 29 June, the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan sent three more notes to the UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan, pointing to seven new cases of violations of the Geneva accords by Pakistan. Since the Geneva Accords came into force, Pakistan has violated them 4,768 times.

However, the Government of Afghanistan and its Armed Forces are operating fairly confidently in this situation in the country, which is still, for now, very complex. The process of the return home from Pakistan of Afghan refugees has picked up in these conditions. Foreign mass media are reporting that they have numbered around 40,000 since April. [end recording]

Iran's Hashemi-Rafsanjani Cited on USSR Visit

PM0407141589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "High Appreciation"]

[Text] Tehran, 3 Jul—"Without the Soviet Union's participation it is impossible to establish an atmosphere of lasting peace in the region," 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, chairman of the Islamic Council Assembly (parliament) of the Islamic Republic of Iran, stated on Sunday [2 July] at a meeting with Pakistani Foreign Minister Sahabzada Yaqub Khan who is visiting Iran, the IRNA news agency has reported. "Our desire for peace and stability," A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani noted, "was the main factor which prompted us to improve relations with the USSR."

For his part the Pakistani foreign minister called A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit to the Soviet Union a "turning point" and stressed that its results are of tremendous significance for the situation in the Middle East.

USSR-Iranian Nuclear Energy Agreement Discussed
NC2906200589 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 29 Jun 89

[From "On the Waves of Radio Moscow" feature]

[Text] Dear listeners, we met with Anatoliy Yerefereyev, an official of the USSR Foreign Economic Relations Ministry and head of the Soviet branch of the standing committee for Soviet-Iranian economic cooperation, and asked him to speak about the part of the Soviet-Iranian agreement that concerns nuclear energy.

[Begin Yerefereyev recording in Russian, fading into Persian translation] First of all, I would like to point out that this part of the agreement speaks about the peaceful use of atomic energy. It not only describes the two countries' cooperation in atomic energy, which is ecologically harmless and extremely economical, but also provides for assistance to Iran in carrying out nuclear research in order to meet the needs of the national economy. A special center for studying radioactive isotopes may be set up in Iran. These isotopes are used in various fields—namely, in improving crops and in the study of seeds. [end recording]

Relations With Iran, Arms Sales to Iran Viewed
LD0307130689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 2 Jul 89

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] I would like to make a few remarks about Iran. After Khomeyni's death it has been comparatively quiet there. In practice there are at present no major opposition forces which could do anything there by way of opposing the regime. A process of clarifying the relationships among the ruling Shi'ite bosses is in progress, and on the whole, a turning toward domestic problems, an extinguishing of extremism in foreign policy, and a striving to get out of international isolation can be observed.

That is precisely the context in which Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit to Moscow should be viewed. The most important result of the visit, the TEHRAN TIMES wrote, was the self-assertion of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the world arena as an independent state having the right to choose new friends, and capable of making decisions in the field of foreign policy. The Soviet Union has never concealed its interest in good relations with its southern neighbor, but it was Khomeyni's excessively anti-Soviet positions which did not promote mutual understanding. Incidentally, the fact that we sent our troops to Afghanistan did not promote it either. Now Iran's course has become more flexible. It is determined not so much by extremist phrases as by the real interests of the state. It was precisely these interests that brought the Iranian politician to Moscow. I am convinced, by the way, that in no time at all the same interests will carry him also to Western capitals.

We have agreed to cooperate with Iran and, in part, to strengthen its defense capacity. As always, this is a great secret. Naturally it is a question of weapons sales. Well, the advantages here are obvious. First, it means hard currency or hard currency goods. Second, it means influence in Tehran, or at least a belief that there is such influence. Well, that's if we take a short-term look. But what if we look at it long-term? Here things are more complicated. What we get is that we are continuing to pump weapons into the most restless region of our planet; and that means we are going to promote the preservation of that restlessness and instability.

According to the data regularly published throughout the world, we, together with the United States, are the leaders in the world's arms trade. This, it seems to me, is difficult to reconcile with the postulates of new political thinking. If, for example, the Kalashnikov assault rifle is found in possession of the warring sides throughout the world, this can hardly substantiate its universal human significance, so to speak, its universal human value. I would like to hope that weapons sales will be placed under control of the Supreme Soviet, and that glasnost—and that means also democracy—will reign supreme also in this important direction of our policy. [video shows Bovin in studio throughout]

Bessmertnykh Meets With Syria's Al-Assad
LD0307174989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1723 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Damascus, 3 July (TASS)—A.A. Bessmertnykh, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR and special representative of the Soviet leadership, was in Damascus on 2-3 July. He was received by H. Al-Assad, president of Syria.

During their conversation, there was an exchange of opinions on current questions concerning the situation in the Near East, and on ways for further strengthening Soviet-Syrian interaction in international affairs. Particular attention was paid to the search for the unblocking of one of the most complex problems of the region: the Lebanese crisis. The shared conviction was expressed that a settlement could be found only by political means, taking into account the interests of all Lebanese. Here the preservation through dialogue and national reconciliation of the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Lebanese state is of particular importance. The constructive role of the "Committee of Three", which is currently undertaking peacemaking efforts on this question, was noted in particular.

It was noted with satisfaction that the friendly relations between the USSR and the Syrian Arab Republic will continue to deepen on the basis of multilateral Soviet-Syrian cooperation.

USSR-Egyptian Consultations Held in Cairo

LD2806224789 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Cairo June 29 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoly Adamishin, who was staying in Egypt at the invitation of the country's Foreign Ministry, held consultations on African problems with Butrus Ghali, minister of state for foreign affairs.

These were the first political contacts of [words indistinct] the two countries.

The friendly and detailed exchange of views, during which the sides largely discussed settlement of conflict situations in Africa, confirmed that the positions of the Soviet Union and Egypt on this problem are rather close.

The sides paid much attention to the situation in the Horn of Africa where there have appeared signs of a trend toward relaxation of tension and establishment of good-neighbourly relations between Ethiopia and Somalia and between Ethiopia and Sudan.

The Soviet Union and Egypt expressed their support for the Ethiopian leadership's publicly-announced desire to find a political solution to the Eritrea problem and put an end to the years-long war.

The next step should be made by Eritrean organisations which should also display readiness to enter into talks with the Ethiopian Government without any preconditions.

The Egyptian side showed much interest in the Soviet attitude to multilateral efforts to settle the conflict in southern Africa and to changes in the political life in South Africa. It spoke highly of the Soviet role in the Namibian settlement.

The sides emphasised the growing importance of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) as the coordinator of African countries' efforts to solve urgent social, economic, ecological and other problems jointly with the United Nations and the whole of the international community.

They called for the OAU's more active role in searching for peaceful solutions to conflicts arising between African countries.

Adamishin and the Soviet ambassador to Egypt, Gennadiy Zhuravlev, were received by Foreign Minister Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid.

Pakistani Intermediate-Range Missile Plans Cited

PM0407122589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jul 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Minister's Statement"]

[Text] Pakistan intends to acquire intermediate-range missiles. This was stated by Sarwar Cheema, Pakistani minister of state for defense. Speaking in the country's national assembly, he asserted that it was essential to acquire suitable armaments to strengthen Pakistan's defense capability in connection with India's recent testing of the Agii [name as transliterated] intermediate-range missile. He said that this is the only possible measure for the country to create an adequate missile potential.

East Europe

Execution, Reburial of Hungary's Nagy Assessed

PM0407142489 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS English No 27, 2 Jul 89 p 7

[Yevgeniy Ambartsumov article: "Imre Nagy's Sacrifice"]

[Text] As I was listening to the radio and reading telegraph reports of the ceremonial reburial of Imre Nagy I started to reminisce. The 1956 events in Hungary are a heavy burden on the hearts of the "children of the 20th Congress", as my generation is often called. 1956 was the year of hope and disappointment and sometimes despair. Khrushchev's revelations of Stalinist crimes went hand in hand with the beginning of ideological restrictions also initiated by Khrushchev. There was the Declaration of October 31 about the new relations with socialist countries, based on non-interference and respect for national sovereignty (a document rejecting "Brezhnev's doctrine" long before it was announced years later) - and the invasion of Budapest, the suppression of the uprising and the treacherous capture of Imre Nagy a few days later.

Tribute to Imre Nagy was paid on June 16, 1989, in Budapest's Tere (Square of Heroes). The Yugoslav Embassy, where Imre Nagy found refuge after our invasion, stands on the same square. He was lured out and arrested - to be hanged in a year's time. Although he was tried by a Budapest judge and executed by a Hungarian hangman, we are the guilty party, especially the then Soviet political leader Khrushchev. Our great reformer was unable to overcome his ingrained Stalinism, and by sanctioning Imre Nagy's execution he pursued the hard-line despotic policy of those who were to topple him several years later.

Of course, the cold war and the hot war waged at the time by the British and French against the Egyptians we supported, played their role, too. This makes the contrast with the present all the more striking. Ours is the time of

new thinking ushered in by the Soviet leader Gorbachev. It is the time of erasing "blank spots" in his history, to use his phrase. I would call them "black spots" though.

I'm sure the time will soon come when the whole truth about the death of Imre Nagy will be told, as will be the truth about the Polish officers exterminated in Katyn, and about Stalin's crimes against his own people, who suffered more than any other.

Socialist countries are exorcising Stalinism with difficulty, and not without resistance. Hopeful reforms in the USSR, Poland and Hungary clash with the suppression of Chinese students' unrest, now declared to be counterrevolutionary. The former General Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Zhao Zhiyang who sympathized with the students is hardly in for Imre Nagy's tragic fate, but the dark shadow of autumn 1956 is hovering over modern China.

It is heart-warming to know that the massacre in Tbilisi, which pales before the one in Beijing two months later, was condemned by the majority of the Soviet people, who regard perestroyka as a democratic revolution. It is quite sympathetic that the Soviet Ambassador attended the funeral ceremony in Budapest. And although the neo-Stalinists frighten Gorbachev with the phantoms of 1956 and 1968, he continues steadily, though not as quickly as some of his compatriots might wish, along the road of reform.

In connection with Imre Nagy's reburial, many commentators in the West and in Hungary itself spoke of him as a victim of communism. We must not forget, however, that he was a Communist himself. The man who looked like Maupassant's petty bourgeois and proved unable to cope with the political wave of 1956, showed great political courage when he refused to betray his convictions and his belief in socialism with a human face to save his own life. That idea, however tragic its evolution, is invincible.

Events of 1956 Examined

LD0207104689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Jul 89

[From the "International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Yevgeniy Tikhonovich Grachev, deputy editor in chief of Moscow radio main news editorial office, with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Antsiferov, editor in chief of the main editorial office of the network of correspondents, and foreign policy commentators Vladimir Ivanovich Fadeyev and Igor Pavlovich Charikov]

[Text] [Marfis] I am Vasiliy Nikolayevich Marfis, chairman of the auditing commission of the "Pamyat Ilicha" collective farm and information and propaganda group chairman. The reburial of Imre Nagy took place in Hungary recently. We know that this was a counterrevolution, and I happened to be in Hungary in 1959. We were told that this counterrevolution operated in a barbaric fashion, murdering individuals, hanging and shooting people, and so on. Now he has been made a national hero. My question is as follows: How are events going to develop there and won't the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party lose its influence and authority among the Hungarian people?

[Fadeyev] You know, what happened on 16 June in Hungary—the reburial of the remains of Imre Nagy and four of his comrades executed in 1956—is one of the factors in the present reexamination of Hungarian history of the past 40 years. I have to say that this is a profoundly internal matter of the Hungarian people and of the present Hungarian Government. The reexamination of these events is not going easily, smoothly, or unequivocally. In this respect I will of course have to mention my own attitude to the events of 1956.

I went to work in Hungary several years after these events, but I remember very well a film—2 hours long, if my memory serves me well—made by Austrian and West German documentary filmmakers. I must tell you, comrades, that however much they attempted to gloss over the situation in those anxious autumn days of 1956, however much they tried to present it as a broad explosion of popular indignation and an outburst on the part of the broad popular masses who went out into the streets, first with just slogans and then, as we know, with weapons, even the makers of the film, who no doubt pursued a definite purpose in making the film—that of compromising the Hungarian Government, our Soviet Army, and our government which deemed it necessary to send in the troops in 1956 to suppress the counterrevolution and render assistance to healthy Hungarian forces—even the makers of the film ended up revealing the truth about the 1956 events. The truth—and the official Hungarian press says this today—is that there were both revolutionary elements and counterrevolutionary elements in the events of 1956. That is the truth, because the people shot, burned, and hanged in the building of the city party committee—communists—were shown on the film made by the Austrians and West Germans, and you cannot evade the fact.

A little after the events, Comrade Kadar himself, who was then leader, called the events of 1956 a glorious revolution in one of his books. Recently, in the course of a reexamination and revision of history, the present government and the present Politburo have split somewhat. Some of them call it a counterrevolutionary rebellion in their official statements. Others do not agree with this. The people who do not agree with it are above all the rank-and-file communists who remember clearly the events of 1956. [sentence as heard] Some of them suffered, others managed to save themselves and go into hiding. At that time, as you will know, communists were treated very cruelly.

To say unequivocally that it was a rebellion, a putsch, or an attempt to effect a revolution is also difficult. I think, and I repeat, that it is a purely internal Hungarian

matter, and they promise in the very near future to publish detailed documents that have survived in archives from the time. We will no doubt be able to make a more detailed and precise assessment of everything that happened in 1956.

Incidentally, comrade Karoly Grosz, in a recent speech, announced that they are changing their point of view, and that he personally is changing his view of the events of 1956, although at one time he had a very clear opinion about this and called the events just a counterrevolution; after all it is true that Imre Nagy too was considered an enemy. They have reviewed their attitude because new documents have appeared which have given them the possibility of changing their point of view. All in all, this too is all part of restructuring, as it were. This is all a new attempt to look more objectively at one's history, even at one's distant history, the same thing that is being done incidentally in our country.

Those of you who have been in Hungary in recent years—I guess that you are there more often than I am—have probably visited the Hungarian museums too; probably you visited them. Probably you also saw the posters, which the Hungarians keep very carefully. They were published, I repeat, in the harsh October and November days of 1956. One poster reminds one very much by its character of the poster we are all familiar with which was published, I think, in 1941 in our country. It seems to me that our poster was called Mother Calls Upon the Motherland. The Hungarians poster was called—there was a woman on it, too, who is standing, appealing. [sentence incomplete as heard] She looks out from the poster at you, and calls out to you to see that the homeland is in danger, in danger because the documents of the provisional Central Committee published at that time stated directly that a white terror had been unleashed.

Polish Plenum, Jaruzelski Nomination Cited

LD0107083789 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] Warsaw July 1 TASS—A joint session of the plenum of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP) Central Committee and the PUWP deputy club in the Sejm was held here. Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PUWP Central Committee, made a statement in view of the proposal by the Politburo of the PUWP Central Committee that he give consent to the nomination of his candidacy to the post of president of the Polish People's Republic.

A PUWP press spokesman said at a news conference that until now Jaruzelski has not given a final answer. The second part of the party plenum will take place later.

Zagladin on Moscow Acceptance of Solidarity

AU0407183089 Paris AFP in English 1722 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Warsaw, July 4 (AFP)—In a symbolic gesture, Poland's former arch-rivals, Solidarity leader Lech Walesa and head of state General Wojciech Jaruzelski, marched side by side into parliament Tuesday for its first session since the national elections.

The two men, who were warmly applauded, walked together to the centre of the assembly before moving to their separate seats.

Mr. Walesa, a Nobel-peace prize winner and the long-time leader of the independent Solidarity trade union opposition, did not stand for parliament and was attending the inaugural session as a special "guest of honour". [passage omitted]

According to a front-page story in Tuesday's edition of Solidarity's newspaper GAZETA, Moscow is now ready to accept a Solidarity government in Poland.

The paper quoted Vadim Zagladin, a top aide to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, as saying: "We will maintain ties with any elected Polish government".

Asked if Moscow would accept a Solidarity government, Mr. Zagladin, speaking in Paris, said: "It is purely a Polish internal affair. Any solution adopted by our Polish friends will be accepted by us." [passage omitted]

Yazov Receives Romanian Deputy Minister

LD0407164789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jul (TASS)—Army General Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, has received Lieutenant General Ilie Ceausescu, member of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee, Socialist Republic of Romania deputy national defense minister and secretary of the Army's Higher Political Council, who is in the Soviet Union leading a delegation of Romanian political workers. A friendly conversation took place, attended by Army General Aleksey Lizichev, head of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Also present during the conversation was Ion Bucur, Romania's ambassador to the USSR.

West Europe

'Unmanned' Soviet MiG-23 Crashes in Belgium

LD0407173689 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—A Soviet military pilot had to eject himself today from a MiG-23 fighter plane at a low altitude because of the failure of aviation equipment during a training flight over Poland. The plane belonged to an air force unit of the Northern Army Group. The pilot remained alive.

The plane continued an unmanned flight to the West and crashed in Belgium.

The Soviet Union is contacting governments of the countries whose air space was crossed by the plane.

Yazov Provides Details

LD0507092989 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT 5 Jul 89

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Kiosa]

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—USSR Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov expressed a supposition that engine system malfunctions underlay the crash of a Soviet MiG-23M plane in Belgium, but emphasised that final conclusions could be drawn only after a commission investigation. The commission has already left for the airfield from which the plane took off.

In an interview to a TASS parliamentary correspondent on Wednesday, the defence minister who is taking part in the USSR Supreme Soviet session, specified that the "extraordinary occurence" took place at 1118 Moscow time, on July 4 during a training flight.

The pilot of the MiG-23M plane which took off from Kolobrzeg airfield (Poland, the northern body of troops) bailed out immediately upon take off at a height of 130-150 metres and landed safely. The plane continued an uncontrolled flight.

General Yazov said that, in all, the MiG-23M covered about 900 km in uncontrolled flight conditions.

It is difficult to say what happened without an investigation, he said. But, as the pilot himself explained, the afterburner spontaneously switched off during the take off and the plane began to decelerate.

Following the bail out, a sufficient thrust, in all probability developed and the plane continued its flight.

The minister, with reference to Western information sources, said the plane fell in the area of the town of Bellegem, 80 km west of Brussels.

During its flight in an area north of Cologne two American planes intercepted the MiG over the FRG's territory. Upon seeing that there was no pilot inside the plane and there was no canopy, they did not shoot it down because the plane was over a densely populated area.

In the crash area, according to data which we now have available Yazov said, the plane slammed into a house, destroying it and killing an 18-year-old boy.

The commission who have been instructed to carry out an investigation, upon agreement with the Belgian side, will fly there to study the causes of what happened and to decide on questions of compensation for the material damage.

General Yazov was not prepared to give an answer to the question asked by the TASS correspondent as to why the uncontrolled flight of the plane was not interrupted over Poland by air defence gunners of that country or by the services of the northern body of Soviet troops.

"It is difficult to say why it was not shot down, why it was not detected. A large-scale investigation should be carried out," he said.

Borsuk on Causes of Crash

LD0507144189 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—"Soviet aviators deeply regret the accident," Colonel General of the Air Force Anatoliy Borsuk, deputy commander-in-chief of the Air Force, commented on the air crash of a pilotless fighter MiG-23M in Belgium on July 4.

In an interview with Tass, he described particulars of the crash. "The aircraft was piloted by Colonel Nikolay Skuridin, military flyer, first class. He has already passed a medical checkup after the ejection and was pronounced healthy. He is an experienced pilot. He flew over 1,700 hours on all types of planes, including 527 hours on MiG-23 fighters.

"That was the first work day for Colonel Skuridin after his home leave. To restore his knacks in piloting, he made a control flight at first on a training military plane, "two-seater". He took off on his own at 11:18 to perform flying exercises. There were no ammunition aboard, apart from the ammunition establishment for the 23mm gun.

"According to the pilot's report, he heard a bang in the area of the air intake after the takeoff at an altitude of some 130 meters when the engine operated at afterburner power. He felt a thrust decay and lowering of the jet. He also registered a decrease in the engine's acceleration and speed. The pilot reported the engine's failure to the flying control office and bailed out at an altitude of some 100 meters.

"After the pilot jettisoned, the plane stopped descent and disappeared over the horizon at a distance of 4-6 kilometers at an extremely low altitude.

"The failure at the takeoff may be explained the following way: the switch-off of the afterburner resulted in a drastic thrust decay, loss of speed, altitude and forced him to bail out. Later, the plane, flying in a stable position without afterburner power, covered some 900 kilometers until fuel was exhausted."

The general said that the above suppositions on the causes of the crash were made on the basis of reports by the pilot and the flying control officer. "The final conclusions will be made by an established commission led by Lieutenant General of the Air Force Yevgeniy Rusanov, chief of the flight safety service of the USSR Defence Ministry. The question is being examined on its flight to Belgium. The fighter is equipped with the system of automatic registration of flight parameters. We hope that it will help (if it is not destroyed) to give a reply to all questions," the general noted.

Reportage on Gorbachev's Visit to France

Agenda of Visit Detailed

LD0307165689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Perhaps the main event to take place over the coming week will begin tomorrow. I mean the official visit to France by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The last preparations for receiving the lofty Soviet guest are now coming to an end in Paris. [passage omitted]

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's arrival with the delegation is expected at about midday local time in Paris; that will be around 1400 Moscow time. All-Union Radio's "Mayak" program plans to run a live relay of this event.

Then, at around 1500 Paris time tomorrow there will be talks between Comrade Gorbachev and Mitterrand, in which delegation members will also participate. The same day, Comrade Gorbachev and his wife, together with French officials, will visit the Place de la Bastille, the famous Bastille that the Parisians destroyed during their revolution. And the day will end with an official dinner in honor of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his wife, which will be given by French President Francois Mitterrand. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Leaves Moscow 4 Jul

LD0407094289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev left Moscow for Paris today on an official visit at the invitation of French President Francois Mitterrand.

Gorbachev is accompanied by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, and Lev Voronin, first deputy prime minister of the USSR.

Comrade Gorbachev was seen off at the airport by Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Ligachev, Medvedev, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, and Chebrikov, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, by Biryukova, Vlasov, Maslyukov, Razumovskiy, and Yazov, candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and by Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Gorbachev Arrives in Paris

LD0407122589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1000 GMT on 4 July broadcasts a live relay from Orly Airport, Paris, where USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev arrived on his visit to France. An unidentified correspondent describes Gorbachev's inspection of the honor guard. The national anthems are played. The correspondent notes that Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, and Tereshkova are among the delegation accompanying Gorbachev.

French President Mitterrand welcomes Gorbachev, saying he is personally glad to see him and to hold talks for the sixth time. He says he hopes that during the visit they will be able to cover a range of issues. The French people attach great hopes to the visit, he adds.

President Gorbachev then says: "Esteemed Mr President, Esteemed Mrs Mitterrand, I would like to express some words of gratitude on my own behalf and on behalf of all my colleagues for the warm words of welcome which you spoke on your own behalf and on behalf of the French people. Mr President, we are very glad to be in France during these days and, at the same time, to express our profound respect for France and its people on behalf of the Soviet people who have deep feelings of friendship for the French. Our people highly value the bonds of friendship and cooperation linking us with France and the people of that country. I also wish to say that we highly value the political diaologue which has been established between us, which has arisen and is developing, and which is assuming a greater scale and depth. I would also like to tell you that I welcome the idea which you expressed to the effect that there are good days ahead of us for continuing this. Thank you for your welcome."

The correspondent reports the departure of Gorbachev and his party in a motorcade bound for the Hotel Marigny. The relay ends at 1022 GMT.

Mitterrand Welcomes Gorbachev

LD0407120689 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 4 Jul 89

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Paris July 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today arrived in Paris on an official visit at the invitation of President Francois Mitterrand of France.

On the tarmac at Orly Airport he was met by Mitterrand. Yakov Ryabov, Soviet ambassador to France and Jean-Marie Merillon, French ambassador to the Soviet Union, were among the welcoming party. The state flags of the USSR and France were hoisted at the airport.

Gorbachev was accorded supreme military honours. A guard of honour of the three arms of the services was mustered on the field and the head of the guard of honour reported to the Soviet leader. The state anthems of the Soviet Union and France were played.

After reviewing the honour guard, Gorbachev and Mitterrand headed to the guest lounge. French minister of state, minister of foreign affairs Roland Dumas, minister of state, minister for the economy and finance, in charge of the budget, Pierre Beregovoy and other members of the French Government were presented to the Soviet president. Soviet officials taking part in the visit were presented to the French president.

Mitterrand welcomed the Soviet guest. He stressed that he was pleased with the opportunity to conduct the sixth set of in-depth talks. Mitterrand expressed hope that Gorbachev's stay in Paris will allow the sides to review all issues concerning peace and development, and also bilateral relations and the situation in Europe. French people welcome you with great joy and great hope bearing in mind the traditional friendship which brings the peoples of France and the USSR together, Mitterrand said. He noted that Gorbachev and his activity evoke immense interest in France.

Gorbachev thanked Mitterrand for the warmth words of welcome and said that Soviet people have warm feelings of friendship toward French people, and expressed deep respect for France and its people.

Soviet people highly value relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries, and the political dialogue which was established and is being developed, reaching an increasingly greater scope and depth. The Soviet leader welcomed Mitterrand's belief that good days are ahead and that the Soviet-French dialogue at summit level will be continued.

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Arrival Remarks

LD0407230189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 4 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in France. [passage omitted] [video shows Gorbachev aircraft arriving, he and Raisa are walking down the steps; Mitterand welcomes them, Gorbachev and Mitterand inspect the guard, and then go on to the lounge for special guests, where Gorbachev is introduced to French officials and Soviets to Mitterrand, and where Mitterrand gives a speech of welcome and Gorbachev replies]:

[Begin Mitterrand recording in French with superimposed Russian translation] Mr President, Madame Gorbachev, we are glad to welcome you for the second time in our country within the framework of an official visit, a state visit, which allows us to greet the Soviet people through you and to welcome you. I am personally glad to see you. This is the sixth time that we have the opportunity to conduct indepth exchanges. I hope that these few days that we are going to spend together will allow us to review all the questions concerning peace and development in the world. And we will talk about ourselves and about Europe. You know that the French gladly welcome you, with great hope, and under these circumstances they will once again find that historic friendship which unites us.

You, deeply Esteemed Madame Gorbachev, who received us so well in your home in Moscow, in your country, you know that we are very glad to receive you here in France for a few days. You evoke lively interest, both you as well as your acts and deeds. And I would like to (?repeat) words of welcome, words of welcome and also to express all the interest is being paid to you and to say to you once again—welcome to our country. Thank you. [end Mitterrand recording]

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Respected Mr President, respected Mrs Mitterrand, I want to express words of thanks on my own behalf and on that of all my colleagues for the warm words of welcome that you have uttered on your own behalf and on behalf of the French people. Mr President, we are very glad to be in France during these days and, in so doing, on behalf of the Soviet people who have a profound feeling of friendship toward the French, to express our profound respect for France and its people. Our people think highly of the ties of friendship and cooperation that link us with France, with the people of this country. And I would also like to say that we think highly of the political dialogue that has been established between us, that has come about and is developing, acquiring increasing scale and depth. And I would like to tell you that I welcome the thought you expressed that good days lie ahead of us in our continuing this matter. I thank you for the welcome. [end recording] [video shows Gorbachev and Mitterrand standing at microphones against background of tapestries and Raisa and Madame Mitterrand sitting down]

[Announcer] After the welcoming ceremony the motorcade headed for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's place of residence offically assigned to him, Marigny.

Gorbachev, Mitterand Begin Talks

LD0407134789 Moscow Tass in English 1323 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 4 TASS—The first conversation between Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, who arrived here today on an official visit, and President Francois Mitterrand of France, just started at the Elysee Palace.

The meeting is expected to last about two hours and, as all signs indicate, it will set the tone for subsequent negotiations to be completed on July 5 with the conclusion of Soviet-French documents.

Newsmen were told at the press centre set up for the visit that the number of accords—about twenty—will be an all-time high in the history of bilateral relations.

They deal both with cooperation in the sphere of trade and economy, and with the development of contacts in science, culture and ecology.

Contents of Talks Reported

LD0407162389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Excerpts] I will start my account of the day's news from the main story: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, began his official visit to France today. Now our program goes over to the direct line from the French capital, Paris. Our special correspondent Pavel Kasparov is on the line. Can you hear me, Pavel?

[Kasparov] Yes, perfectly. [passage omitted] At the moment, it is still difficult to say with certainty which particular subjects were touched upon in this first conversation between the two top leaders of our two countries, nevertheless, quite naturally, bilateral relations and European developments were discussed.

Literally a few seconds before we came on the air, Mikhail Sergeyevich gave an interview to our television correspondent Anatoliy Popov on his impressions, first impressions of his initial talks. In that interview, he stressed the fact that he had been happy with the way the talks started and that the French president and the Soviet leader focused their attention, among other things, on issues of European development, above all. And just now, Oleg Maksimenko arrived here in my studio. Oleg, you attended other talks, simultaneous talks with Mikhail Sergeyevich and Francois Mitterrand, between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and Roland Dumas, foreign affairs minister...

[Maksimenko, interrupting] Quite right. Literally 10 minutes ago I was present at the ceremony at which the first accords were signed out of the 20 plus that are to be signed during the French-Soviet summit. I must specify that these accords which have been signed at the Quai d'Orsay, that is, at the French Foreign Affairs Ministry, account only for a part of all accords which have been signed today. In other places, accords are being signed, among other things, on...

[Kasparov, interrupting] On parliamentary ties, right?

[Maksimenko] Yes, on parliamentary ties, among other things, representatives of the military departments are signing accords, as well as others. Quite naturally, not all of the accords are going to be signed today. I would like to tell you about the accords which have been signed at the French Foreign Affairs Ministry. The first accord deals with youth exchanges. The second accord is associated with preventing incidents at sea and out of the bounds of territorial waters. Another accord—and it is of great interest because it is unprecedented in the practice of relations between our countries—that accord deals with cooperation in the field of state archives. And one more agreement, the last one which was signed by Roland Dumas, France's foreign affairs minister, literally a few minutes ago, is an accord on combatting drug abuse.

[Kasparov] As transpires from your account, the program is very saturated, vast and, above all, fruitful?

[Maksimenko] Yes, and the fact is that right now, Mikhail Sergeyevich is visiting, in the company of Francois Mitterrand, a special facility where he is shown a novelty, a novelty in the field of science and technology, and possibly, so to speak, it will become our joint novelty. What I mean is high-resolution television. And the conversation of our correspondent with Mikhail Sergeyevich took place exactly there. And following that, when they have finished viewing the high-resolution television device, Mikhail Sergeyevich and Raisa Maksimovna will head for the Place de la Bastille. As you know, France is preparing for the ceremony celebrating the 200th anniversary of the great French Revolution, and without the Bastille, quite naturally, that celebration would have been simply impossible. Oleg, could you tell us in a few words what the Bastille is?

[Maksimenko] Yes, I will, naturally, tell you about the Bastille, but before that, I would like, at least for a few seconds, to go back to the Foreign Affairs Ministry where not only the signing of documents has taken place, but also working talks.

[Kasparov] Oleg, excuse me, but we are running out of our air time, so, can you be brief, please. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Comments on Meeting

LD0407163589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] We have just received a report from Paris. On completing his first meeting with French President Francois Mitterrand, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave an interview to journalists. He said, among other things:

[Begin recording] The issues are related to cooperation in all spheres at the present stage, a new stage, a turning point in history. All countries are adapting to meet the challenges of the times and that subject dominated my first meeting with Mr President. Well, it ended with the feeling that we would like to listen one more time to the

information reports and witness the implementation of an idea which was the topic of my conversation with Mr President that took place in Moscow, if I remember it correctly. Yes. At the time, we agreed to discuss it, those cooperation possibilities. I welcome cooperation and it is very important within the framework of implementing the idea to which we refer as constructing a common European home in which both I and the president hope our peoples will take an active part in both developing the architecture of that home, its design, and its construction, and then, later, in representing some of the residents of that home. And that, therefore, envisages a boost in communication between people, a boost in cultural exchanges. It is a crucial element of communication among the European peoples. That is why I thank the president again for this invitation to come back to that idea, and we are probably going to dwell on its practical side. [end recording]

More on Gorbachev-Mitterrand Talks

PM0507102789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talks Between M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand"]

[Text] Talks began in Paris 4 July between M.S. Gorbachev and French President Francois Mitterrand. This is already their sixth meeting. The interlocutors know each other well and value the high level of the frank and large-scale dialgoue characteristic of the relations that have taken shape between them. This time too, in a free exchange of opinions, they discussed the major problems in the field of vision of both states, which play such an important role in European and world affairs.

F. Mitterrand took an interest in the course of restructuring in the USSR and expressed the opinion that the Soviet people, in whose potential and optimism he believes, will see through to the end what has been conceived.

M.S. Gorbachev described the special features of the crucial moment in the process of Soviet society's renewal. A real transfer of power from the party to the soviets has begun. This is already being realized in practice in the top echelon and is beginning in the provinces and in the republics—as the country is being drawn into the second stage of the reform of the political system.

In addition to revolutionary restructuring in the Soviet Union, the first conversation centered on the tremendous changes occurring in other countries. The world's development in the immediate and distant future is now being determined in practice, M.S. Gorbachev said.

There are objective reasons that have resulted in the need for changes. But this is accompanied by theoretical and political questing, by profound changes in public awareness. There is an earnest process of consideration, reflection, and intellectual ferment. Passions are seething, contradictions are arising, and positions are clashing. Naturally, certain threats and unforeseen turns of events arise.

It is now extremely important to clarify the questions that arise. No messianism. The people themselves will decide their fate and extricate their country from crises and difficulties, but on the basis of a correct policy, on the basis of correct ideas. Therefore they must have a better and more correct understanding of the essence of processes. And glasnost and democratization are needed for this.

No one must be denied the right to resolve his own tasks and to transform his own country on the basis of his own values, on the basis of historically evolved conditions and possibilities. Changes are taking place in European countries, for example, at different rates, at different depths, and with different degrees of radicalness. These countries are different, even if they belong to the same system, and they will continue to be different when the very disparate versions of their independent social choice have been realized. But this does not abolish their interconnected and interdependent nature.

There is no doubt, M.S. Gorbachev said, that, despite all the differences, the general thrust of the changes and their overall results will be useful not only for these countries' peoples themselves but also for the whole of Europe.

It is very important to ensure the adaptation of the world community and of the chief forces operating in world politics to these profound, diverse, and complex phenomena, and their adaptation under conditions of cooperation.

It is now the responsibility of politicians to prevent the destabilization of the situation and to rule out attempts to exploit in egotistic interests the very complex and sometimes acute events in other countries.

World European politics now needs a very large-scale vision of the processes, a modern level of what is happening.

In particular, the significance of regular summit meetings of states' leaders was noted in this connection. And this does not necessarily have to be combined with the signing of agreements. However, it is also important that the results of such meetings, even if not recorded documentarily, be reflected in further policy.

M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand exchanged opinions on the situation in the Near East. They noted the continued closeness of their positions and expressed readiness to act more vigorously in support of the

positive trends which have taken shape in the Arab world and which make it possible to accelerate the process of a settlement. There is now an increased chance of this.

Special attention was devoted to the situation in Lebanon. M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand briefed each other on their contacts with the Arab League's "committee of three." They discussed the special features of the Arab states' approach to the Lebanese problem and agreed to set forth their positions in a joint statement.

Questions of bilateral economic ties were touched on in the talks.

F. Mitterrand invited M.S. Gorbachev to familiarize himself right there, in the Elysee Palace, with the results of developing high-definition television. Models of new equipment were shown, and a film made using the equipment was demonstrated. There was a brief discussion with representatives of the firms that created this technology. Answering questions, M.S. Gorbachev said that this work is not only of technical significance. It is part of the effort to build the common European home.

Gorbachev Activities in Paris 4 Jul

LD0507105089

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 4 July, in the "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts an 8-minute report over video of Gorbachev's arrival in Paris and subsequent activities. Correspondent Potapov describes the video pictures of Gorbachev's motorcade arriving in the center of Paris and being joined by horse guards escorted by the Elysee Palace.

Gorbachev is then shown walking across the courtyard of the palace to meet Mitterrand on the steps. The two pose for photographs with their wives on the steps. Potapov explains that an official lunch for the Gorbachevs follows. The camera shows the two couples seated at a table, then the four walking round the grounds of the palace during the "several minutes devoted to a tour of the palace."

Gorbachev and Mitterrand are then shown from a distance, walking and talking on the lawn. The two then go back indoors and are shown seated side by side in Mitterrand's office, exchanging remarks. Potapov notes that "the talks will begin in a few minutes."

The next clip shows Mitterrand and Gorbachev in a group walking along an alleyway and into the Elysee Palace television studio complex. Mitterrand is shown introducing Gorbachev to the personnel there, then the two sit down to watch a high-definition television film, a system which, Potapov explains, France plans to introduce at a later date. As Potapov explains how the system works, the director of the project is shown explaining to the guests. After the film, the narrator comes forward to present Gorbachev with a bouquet. Gorbachev says: "Thank you" and kisses her.

The video then shows Gorbachev and Mitterrand with correspondent Potapov talking.

"[Gorbachev] First of all, I want to say that Mr President and I have already resumed our conversation, and they are covering a wide range of problems. I must say that in the person of the French president we have a favored interlocutor. We value the high level of these conversations and their importance, not only for bilateral relations but also for the appraisal of the problems of world politics. That is the first thing.

"Secondly, we are very pleased to be here at a time when our friends, the land of France, which is friendly toward us, and the French people are marking a great festive event—the anniversary of the French Revolution. By our presence, we wish to express our respect for France and for its people, and to express the feelings of respect of the Soviet people." [passage omitted]

"[Potapov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, are you satisfied with the start of the talks?

"[Gorbachev] There is complete satisfaction." As the video shows Gorbachev moving away, correspondent Potapov is heard to say "thank you."

The video then shows a group of unidentified people walking down a street.

Mitterrand Hosts Dinner 4 Jul

LD0407193989 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 4 TASS—A dinner in honour of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on an official visit here and Raisa Gorbachev was given this evening in the Elysee Palace on behalf of French President Francois Mitterrand. Present at the dinner from the Soviet side were Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Lev Voronin, other officials, as well as a large group of representatives of the Soviet public, scientists, workers in the arts.

Francois Mitterrand and Mikhail Gorbachev exchanged speeches.

Mitterrand Remarks at Dinner

LD0407205189 Moscow TASS in English 2032 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 4 TASS—President Francois Mitterrand of France has described Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to France as the continuation of a constructive political dialogue between France and the USSR. Speaking on Tuesday at a dinner given for the Soviet leader, the president pointed out that the visit was taking place at the time when Europe was making a turn from the era of division and confrontation to the era of mutual understanding and cooperation.

Mitterrand welcomed the concept of the creation of a "European Home" which, in his opinion, has a solid basis. Of course, he continued, there remain obstacles to overcome and mistrust to be dispelled. However, the awareness of the existing problems is a big step forward.

The president dwelt on disarmament problems and stressed that perceptible progress had been achieved in this sphere. He welcomed the resumption of Soviet-American talks on strategic offensive armaments and wished them success.

Mitterrand spoke about the identity or similarity of stands of the USSR and France with regard to ways of settling the Middle East and other regional conflicts.

Touching upon Soviet-French bilateral relations, the president expressed hope that they would continue to develop successfully and stressed that numerous agreements that had been signed already or would be signed during Gorbachev's visit to Paris were laying a solid legal foundation for it.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

PM0507104589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev spoke on 4 July at a dinner in the Elysee Palace. He said:

Respected Mr President!
Respected Mrs Mitterrand!
Ladies, gentlemen, comrades!

I thank Francois Mitterrand for his kind words and all of those French men and women who have greeted us for their cordiality and hospitality.

The first thing I would like to talk about here is the unusual nature of the circumstances of our visit. Having found ourselves on French soil we immediately felt and somehow entered into the atmosphere of the celebrations with which the French people are marking the 200th anniversary of their revolution—a great event in their history and in world history.

Lenin said of it: "The whole 19th century, that century which gave civilization and culture to all humanity, passed under the auspices of the French Revolution."

The revolution itself and its consequences were of tremendous significance to Russia. The events at the beginning of the last century took such a turn—and this is also instructive—that France's departure from the ideals of the revolution led to a major war between our countries. This left not only traces of ill will in people's memories but it also—and this is one of history's paradoxes—brought our peoples closer to one another and aroused a deep mutual interest and strengthened the process of mutual influence.

The spiritual relations between our countries and the constant intercrossing of cultural streams were a factor in general European development. The spirit of the French Revolution was constantly present in the social life of our country. Its ideological legacy played a prominent role in the preparation of social forces in Russia for their own great revolution.

Therefore we feel ourselves to be rightful participants in your festivities in every way, but also because in our country deep transformations are unfolding and are already going ahead on the paths of restructuring.

Restructuring is also a revolution. I hope that a great fate is destined for it, not only on a national scale. Simple, but great ideas inspired the people in the years of 1789-89, 200 years ago, just as they did people in the 1917-24. They are inspiring the present generation in the USSR too, which is taking upon its shoulders an unbelievably heavy, but historically inevitable task regarding the revolutionary renewal of a huge, multinational country that is worthy of happiness.

Freedom, equality and brotherhood, if one interprets this broadly, this is you see, the victory of values that are common to all mankind. This is freedom of choice for peoples and individuals. This is the primacy of right and moral norms, this is respect for the values of each nation. This is the trust of one people in another, of one man in another man. This is the solidarity and recognition of the community of human fate. All this also applies to our restructuring.

Now we are scrutinizing the heritage of the French Revolution in a new way. We are interpreting many of its turning points and slogans in a different way. We are learning the lessons of the present day from the experience of it and from its tragedies. Now the spirit of the declaration of rights of a person and a citizen is easier for us to understand. People are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social differences can be based solely on considerations of the general good.

It is right that the first stage of the conference on the human dimension of the Europe-wide process took place in Paris. When opening it, you, Mr President, spoke of the significance that France attributes to the protection of the rights and freedoms of individual people and of whole peoples. We share your approach and are prepared to take part—both through efforts within our country, as well as in the international arena—in making the process of the humanization of relations between states acquire a universal character and in making the victory of the unfading slogan of the French Revolution draw near.

Gentlemen, we are also here among you because last year in Moscow the president and I agreed to make Soviet-French summit meetings a regular occurrence, and when possible to meet every year. My conversations with President Mitterrand in the autumn and today have

disclosed that we have quite a lot in common in our ideas on the main challenges of the modern epoch, on those "Bastilles" that mankind still has to take.

We agree upon the fact that the USSR and France are capable of contributing outstanding material and making an intellectual contribution to the solution of European and world problems. We proceed from the fact that their cooperation is especially important at the present moment of breakthrough, when the need is felt in Europe and everywhere for bold ideas and combined efforts.

Europe is gradually becoming accustomed to the approach of a period of peace which has become possible for the first time in its entire dramatic history. Many have quite rightly seen the signs of it—and we are glad of that—in the recent Soviet-West German meeting. Perhaps it is symbolic that our visits to the FRG and to France took place at practically the same time. We talked with Chancellor Kohl about the significance of the Franco-West German reconciliation and the significance of the Soviet-French accord. We understand the bond contained in it. It is no accident that our poet Aleksandr Blok wrote of the peoples of Russia:

"Everything is intelligible to us, both keen Gallic thought, and gloomy German genius."

The "postwar period" is over. However, whereas in the past, such periods used to be followed by prewar ones, now we see an opening to a lasting peace, based not on a balance of forces but on a balance of real, correctly understood interests.

That is a chance that Europe has in its hands. Whether or not we will manage to enable Europe to meet the challenges of our and future times, will depend on you and me, on all Europeans along with Americans and Canadians.

I am confident that the Soviet-French concord is an indispensible element in fostering the European unity which is essential if Europe is to fulfill its destiny vis-a-vis its own peoples and the present-day world as a whole.

France and the USSR are now sharing a table of negotiations on disarmament. I mean the Vienna talks on conventional arms and on confidence-building measures. We prove with proposals and practical measures, including unilateral ones, how seriously we regard the unprecedentedly difficult but also historically pressing task of cutting down to a minimum the stockpiles of weapons, while preserving stability and strengthening overall security. However a successful outcome of the talks is a matter for everyone, and it depends on all their participants, France not being the last among them.

The talks got off to a good start. The proposals tabled by the sides are close in some areas and sometimes even identical. We see that as the result of the efforts to improve the international climate which recent years have been noted for. However, I cannot fail to note that the problem of tactical-nuclear weapons could at a certain stage seriously delay the resolution of the main European task—the elimination of military confrontation.

The Soviet idea about a meeting of the leaders of the countries of Europe, the United States and Canada is well known. The topicality of this idea has not decreased. On the contrary, by the way, the holding of such a meeting is also in accordance with the desires of the NATO council to accelerate the Vienna talks.

Aware of the responsibility which we bear as permanent members of the Security Council, Mr President and I again discussed ways to help resolve regional conflicts. The USSR and France were at the source of the initiative connected with the idea of an international conference on the Near East. Today we came to the conclusion that the situation is ripe to hold it. We are prepared to cooperate on this question with the European Community where France began its chairmanship a few days ago. We are both extremely worried about the situation in Lebanon. We agreed to make a joint statement and we will render all the help available to us to the "Committee of Three" of the Arab League. We agreed to assist the negotiating process on the Cambodian problem. We wish success to the forthcoming Paris conference on Cambodia. Our approaches on other regional problems also are quite close.

We had a fundamental discussion of the whole area of Soviet-French economic links, paying particular attention to the most advanced scientific and technical areas.

The painstaking work carried out by our representatives after the Soviet-French summit meeting last year is encouraging. It seems that an unprecedented package of agreements has been prepared and will be signed and not only in the economic sphere.

Three weeks ago in Bonn we signed a dozen agreements. That was a record. Now it has been exceeded. We welcome such "competition."

Apart from everything else, it expands and strengthens the treaty and legal framework of the European process.

Naturally, it is important to ensure that agreements do not remain just fine texts for historians. I have formed the impression that there are opportunities for overcoming the phase of "decline" in economic ties and beginning an upward trend again.

It is a sign of the times that there has been a resumption of contacts between the armed forces of our two countries. It is an important thoroughfare toward trust and mutual understanding and it has, practically, been closed over the last 10 years. The agreement on contacts between servicemen, also due to be signed in Paris, will

make it possible thoroughly to discuss the military doctrines and concepts, to reach a more in-depth understanding of each other's intentions and it will strengthen the predictability factor.

Finally, I would like to mention this here. With the legacy of an enormous potential of our mutual cultural enrichment created in the past, we have been confronted by the fact that we have an altogether scant knowledge of each other's modern culture. The "cold war" has made itself thoroughly felt here. I think that through the opening of cultural centers in Moscow and Paris, the expansion of youth exchanges and better organized language teaching, contacts between people, between French and Soviet families, will help to rectify the situation relatively fast.

Mr President, the present visit, as our previous meetings, reflects the mood of our peoples, their mutual friendliness and respect and the deep, inexhaustible interest in each other. I believe that you and I are acting in the mainstream of these sentiments, safeguarding conditions for an all-round cooperation and bringing our countries and peoples closer together. I am confident that this benefits not merely them, but also the whole of Europe and the entire world community.

To your health, Mr President and Mrs Mitterrand!
To trust and friendship between the Soviet and French people!

Gorbachev Talks to Parisians

LD0507044589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent Potapov] We have just returned from the Place de la Bastille which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva visited today. On this historic square, the venue of national demonstrations, the Soviet leader received a warm and sincere welcome. [video shows cars arriving at the square; correspondents, bodyguards, and crowds surrounding the Gorbachevs] Of course, the Parisians asked questions about restructuring and about life in our country. Returning from the Place de la Bastille, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met and conversed with Parisians on the streets of the French capital. [video shows Gorbachev, with his arm around Raisa, speaking to the crowd and then stretching to shake hands with the Parisians]

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] But the people have already accepted it [restructuring] with their hearts and minds. Now the course has to be verified. Everything must be verified to prevent it from misfiring. It is not possible to stop. To go backwards is inadmissible. It would lead to disaster. But as we move forward, it should not be done in leaps, but steadily, step by step. The young ones want to force its pace. So do I—which proves that I am still young! [applause]" [video shows Gorbachev addressing a young girl in front of him]

[Gorbachev] What's your name? What's your name?

[Interpreter] Fatima.

[Gorbachev] Fatima? Why, we have that name. Where are you from? Do you live in Paris?

[Interpreter] She is in fact of Moroccan origin, but was born here in Paris.

[Gorbachev] Fatima, Fatima. Pretty. Well, Fatima, [Gorbachev holds girl's hand] I think things will be better for you. And things aren't so bad for us. Let's not be too pessimistic. Nonetheless, nonetheless, nonetheless, the people of the world are turning to face one another.

[Interpreter, translating for unidentified man] It depends on you, in part, that this happens.

[Gorbachev] Yes, yes. Fine. Thank you very much. [video then shows Gorbachev thanking crowd in French] [end recording]

Gorbachev Tours Arc de Triomphe

LD0507092889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0845 GMT 5 Jul 89

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Paris, 5 Jul (TASS)—The second day of M.S. Gorbachev's stay in France started at the Arc de Triomphe, one of the most striking sights of the French capital and at the same time the Parisians' most precious relic. Here under the arch lies the tomb of the unknown soldier. M.S. Gorbachev laid a wreath at the tomb and wrote in the honorary visitors' book. Hundreds of Parisians gathered at the Place Charles de Gaulle to greet the Soviet head of state.

Gorbachev Meets With Chirac

LD0507103189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0936 GMT 5 Jul 89

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Paris, 5 Jul (TASS)—The next point in the second day of the visit took in a very old urban milieu of Paris—the town hall. The Soviet guest was met at the entrance by Jacques Chirac, mayor of Paris.

After a look at the sights of the town municipal building, there was a brief talk between Mikhail Gorbachev and Jacques Chirac.

A particular place in the 350-year old history of the Paris town hall, built under Louis XIII, is occupied by the events connected with the great French Revolutiuon. Robespierre was arrested here. In 1871 the Paris Commune was proclaimed on the square in front of the town hall.

Shevardnadze, Dumas Discuss European Issues

LD0407214489 Moscow TASS in English 2046 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 4 TASS—A meeting between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas was held here today in the framework of Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to France.

The contacts between the heads of the two diplomatic agencies have been developing intensively and regularly of late, in keeping with arrangements reached during the Soviet-French summit in Moscow in November last. It was noted with satisfaction that the work for their implementation made it possible to advance Soviet-French cooperation considerably and prepare tangible and specific conditions for the success of the new summit.

In the context of the Soviet-French talks at the summit level, the ministers concentrated on a detailed analysis of some specific directions of cooperation of the USSR and France in matters of European and world politics, in various areas of bilateral relations.

It was emphasised that the documents on the development of bilateral cooperation prepared for the visit lay down a solid basis in the context of law for switching it to new lines, specifically, in the areas of economic, scientific, technological and cultural relations. The ministers agreed to create a mechanism for verifying practical implementation of bilateral agreements.

Europe, the European process, the construction of a common European home are the priority area of the implementation of understanding of the two countries in matters of international politics. The ministers emphasised that the interaction of the two countries can effectively promote the Helsinki process, the European initiatives which is shown, specifically, by the fact that the joint Soviet-French proposal for evolving unified legal principles in Europe was supported at the Paris conference on the human dimension of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). In this connection it was agreed to continue cooperation in the area of law and to consolidate the infrastructure of the talks created by the foreign ministries of the two countries, as well as to start specific dialogue on the preparation for other European forms.

Much attention was given to prospects of arrangements on the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe. Taking into account mutual interest of the sides in a speedy pace of the Vienna talks, it was decided to intensify bilateral consultations on all their problems. There was also an exchange of opinions on the possibility of implementing the idea of creating in some or other form a war risk reduction centre in Europe and on prevention of surprise attack, as an important element of maintaining stability in Europe.

The sides discussed some problems related to nuclear disarmament.

The possibilities of Soviet-French interaction in lowering regional tension were discussed in detail. The sides declared in favour of a reliable ceasefire and opening of a broad dialogue in Lebanon to settle the conflict.

It was noted that due to broad international efforts there has been a substantial progress in the settlement related to Cambodia. An international conference on this matter being convened in Paris assumes special importance in this connection. The ministers expressed the wish that it be a success.

Shevardnadze Comments on Talks

LD0407204889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] [Announcer] A meeting between ministers of foreign affairs of the two countries took place in the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 4 July. After the meeting, Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, said in particular in the interview to newsmen:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording in Russian with simultaneous translation into French] I think that all that is taking place now, these days in Paris is, indeed, a result of the new political thinking, whose principles are gradually being established in the European conditions, so to speak, and on the world arena as a whole. The main political event is, of course, now taking place in the Elysee Palace, where Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Mitterrand are meeting.

Our meeting, held within the framework of his visit was successful and very interesting. We discussed very broad areas of problems, which represent mutual interests. I already spoke about this. It is the economy, economic and trade cooperation, scientific and technical cooperation where there exist splendid prospects. We even got as far as space. Very interesting projects have taken shape. There are very interesting plans in the sphere of culture. We have only just signed some agreements. A cultural agreement, an agreement on setting up cultural centers in Paris and in Moscow, on youth exchange, so to speak, and on many other things, will be signed tomorrow. The military establishments are also signing a very important agreement. It is a special sphere, which, so to speak, tells about the degree of confidence, the confidence, the mutual confidence which is being established between our states and our peoples. So that, indeed, taking into account the quantity and the quality of the documents,

which are being signed, this event is, indeed, unique from the viewpoint of Soviet-French cooperation and not just from this viewpoint. [end recording]

Shevardnadze, Dumas Interviewed

LD0407193589 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 4 TASS—The ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR and France gave interviews after signing a number of Soviet-French documents today.

"Our negotiations during which a broad range of questions was touched upon passed extremely well", said Roland Dumas, French minister of foreign affairs. He expressed the confidence that Mikhail Gorbachev's current visit will become a remarkable landmark in relations between France and the Soviet Union.

"Everything that takes place in Paris now is a result of the new political thinking whose principles are being gradually asserted in Europe and the world scene", Eduard Shevardnadze said. He appraised the meeting with Roland Dumas as effective and interesting and opening broad prospects for cooperation in various areas. The number and quality of documents that have already been signed or are to be signed shows that the current Soviet-French summit is an event of unique importance and not only for bilateral relations", the Soviet minister emphasised.

Yakovlev Meets With French Senate President

LD0407192889 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 4 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, accompanying Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on an official visit to France, met Alain Poher, president of the French Senate, today to discuss security and cooperation in Europe and the Soviet-French relations. The meeting was also attended by members of the Senate Foreign Relations, Defense and Armed Forces Commission.

The talks also focused on the progress of perestroika and its present tasks. Special attention was paid to economic development and inter-ethnic relations in the light of democratic reforms under way in the Soviet Union.

Meets With Members of Senate

LD0507083489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Senate, the building of the lower chamber of the French Parliament. A meeting took place here today between Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev and members of the Senate. [Video shows Yakovlev coming up some stairs, then shaking hands with unidentified person] The Soviet visitor was welcomed by Jean Lecanuet, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission, Jacques Chaumont, chairman of the Senate group on friendship with the Soviet Union, Maurice Couve de Murville, the former French foreign minister, as well as representatives of the various political parties in the Senate. [video shows Yakovlev talking to several unidentified people]

Ties With France Viewed on Eve of Gorbachev Trip

Voronin Examines Economic Ties

LD0307131489 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text]l Moscow July 3 TASS—The sum total of contracts on mutual supply of goods and equipment signed by the Soviet Union and France in 1989 is more than 2.3 billion roubles. The two countries' mutual commodity circulation in 1989 was 2.8 billion roubles and further growth is expected, Lev Voronin, Soviet first deputy prime minister and chairman of the Soviet side of the intergovernment Soviet-French commission on economic and scientific-technical cooperation, told TASS.

He said that a new contractual and legal basis of business relations is now being worked out and the cooperation mechanism is being improved. The relations in such areas as the agro-industrial complex, railway transport, chemistry, oil exploration and extraction, nuclear energy, peaceful uses of space and the development of a new generation colour television are also enlarging. An intergovernmental agreement on mutual encouragement and defence of investments which will enlarge the flood of French capital to the Soviet market has recently been prepared. It will be signed during Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to France.

Soviet-French business relations prioritise the development of cooperation, joint enterprise and other forms of direct relations between producers. As of July 1st twenty-three joint Soviet-French ventures had been established in the Soviet Union. Eleven mixed societies with Soviet participation have also been established in France. They introduce Soviet machino-technical goods, timber and chemical products to the French market and also transport, bank and insurance services.

Soviet organisations encourage French firms to cooperate in third countries' markets. The partners completed mutual supplies to build gas-mains in Iraq, Algeria and Libya, conventional power stations in Algeria, Iraq and Iran and metallurgical works in Nigeria. This practice is now continuing.

Cooperation in crediting and bank spheres is developing. Forty-seven French banks have already become Soviet partners. They lead among creditors from the capitalist countries in the amount of enlisted short-term credits (under one year).

At the same time the present level of Soviet-French cooperation doesn't meet the possibilities and necessities of both sides, Voronin said. A number of proposals to enlarge it have been made in connection with this. The French side has received a list of machino-technical and other products which can be supplied in larger amounts to France and also a list of proposals to establish new joint ventures in the Soviet Union according to regional principles. French firms have been invited to participate in the exploration of the natural resources of the Kola peninsula. France has also been offered the chance to enlarge the extraction of Soviet gas by 2-3 billion cubic meters a year in exchange for supplies of consumer goods.

Voronin stressed that the forthcoming Soviet-French summit will improve economic relations between the two countries and determine their main directions for the 1990's.

Voronin Analyzes Trade Problems

LD0407212389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1111 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jul (TASS)—"The possibilities for further increasing supplies of raw materials and energy resources, excluding gas, from the USSR to France, as well as imports of foodstuffs and complete pieces of equipment from that country, have been virtually exhausted," Lev Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Soviet section of the Intergovernmental Commission on Scientific, Technical, and Economic Cooperation between the USSR and France, said on Monday in a conversation with a TASS correspondent.

This is one of the basic problems holding back an increase in mutual trade turnover. The reserve for developing Soviet-French trade and economic relations over the next few years lies in rationalization of the structure of bilateral business contacts, development of cooperative ties, and broader joint entry into third-country markets. However, the inadequacy of the information possessed by the two sides' business circles about the potentials and interests of Soviet and French enterprises and firms, and about the national legislation regulating their foreign economic operations, is still to some extent presenting an obstacle to their wide-scale interaction. The leader of the Soviet section of the Intergovernmental Commission considers that a great deal of work will have to be done in this area by the Franco-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, the activity of which must be reoriented toward serving medium-sized and small enterprises and firms.

Another problem in Soviet-French ties is connected with the limited opportunities for acquiring hard currency funds for the purchase of goods. For this reason, attention should be paid to the broader utilization of barter and concessionary deals, to the involvement of firms providing services under conditions of risk, and to the establishment of consortiums and associations.

In Lev Voronin's opinion, these problems can be overcome only through joint efforts. There are, however, problems which depend either only on the French side or only on the Soviet side. Thus, the principle of most-favored nation status which operates in Soviet-French business relations is applied with a reservation which places Soviet goods in an unequal position with regard to custom duty, in connection with France's participation in the Common Market. There are nontariff restrictions on the import of goods from the USSR to France. Cases where anti-dumpting legislation is applied to Soviet products have a negative effect. The negative influence of the COCOM restricted lists continues to exist.

In turn, the quality of Soviet goods offered for export to France are required to be substantially raised, and the operation of Soviet enterprises and organizations needs to be made more democratic.

It is also necessary to seek opportunities for developing bilateral trade on a more balanced basis. This has been noted in the declaration on principles for the development and improvement of cooperation between the two countries which has been prepared for signing in the course of Mikhail Gorbachev's current visit to France.

Moiseyev Views Military Relations

LD0407085789 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—The Soviet-French agreements on mutual contacts in the military field ensure well enough the development of relations between the two countries' armed forces, a Soviet general told TASS before leaving for Paris.

Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff, will accompany Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on his visit to France.

The 50-year-old general said that the Soviet Union and France had for long maintained firm military ties, based on two-year agreements on relations between their armed forces, and regularly exchanged visits by military officials, warships and air force squadrons.

"Regrettably, in 1979, in connection with the events in Afghanistan, the French side froze these relations, which have begun to thaw only recently," Moiseyev said.

He said that the Soviet visit by French Defence Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement last April contributed much to the thaw.

"In the opinion of both sides, that visit marked the full revival of military ties between the two countries," the general said, adding that "the time has come to go further and extend bilateral military contacts" and that "there are all possibilities for that."

He said that the French side favours the Soviet-U.S. Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force Treaty and positively regards Soviet-U.S. talks on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive armaments, given the ABM Treaty is observed and outer space is not militarised, and some other issues.

At the same time, he noted that the positions of the Soviet Union and France on a number of issues differ. He said these issues can become the subject of an interested dialogue during Soviet-French summit talks.

"During the visit, we're ready to sign an agreement on mutual contacts between the two countries' armed forces in 1990-1991." Moiseyev said. "And we're ready to do it with profound respect for the friendly people of France and its Armed Forces."

Course of Military Ties Assessed

PM0207172589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jul 89 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondent Captain 1st Rank V. Kuzar: "USSR-France: New Stage of Cooperation"]

[Excerpts] Paris, 30 Jun—These days France is looking forward to two portentous events: M.S. Gorbachev's visit begins 4 July, and on 14 July the country's people celebrate the bicentennial of Bastille Day. [passage omitted]

Today the peoples have a right to expect the upcoming Soviet-French dialogue to raise relations between our countries to a new level. And there is a need for this. Take, for example, a sphere such as trade and economic cooperation. Neither its volume, its structure, nor its dynamics can satisfy both partners today. France holds fourth place among the USSR's West European trading clients. It buys goods from the Soviet Union worth Fr17 billion a year and sells us goods worth Fr10 billion. Various obstacles prevent the exchange from expanding, including ones such as the French restriction on the sale of 300 different Soviet goods, the lists of the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls, and so forth. And businessmen are not making use of the new opportunities that have been opened up in our country. Of almost 150 joint ventures, French capital has been involved only in the creation of approximately 10.

I would like to single out another sphere in Soviet-French relations. This is the military sphere. Quite strong military ties existed between our countries for a long time. They were implemented on the basis of 2-year agreements on relations between the armed forces of the USSR and France. There were regular exchanges of visits by military chiefs, warships, and squadrons of combat aircraft, and there were good contacts between military educational institutions and sportsmen. In 1979 the French side froze these relations in connection with the events in Afghanistan. And a thaw has begun here only recently.

French Defense Minister J.-P. Chevenement visited the Soviet Union in April 1989. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA provided detailed coverage of that visit, during which the French minister was received by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, had thorough talks at the USSR Ministry of Defense, and had an opportunity to visit a number of military units and garrisons. The sides evaluated J.-P. Chevenement's visit as marking the full restoration of military ties between the USSR and France. It is now probably necessary to go further and expand bilateral contacts along military lines. This would help to strengthen trust between our peoples.

The coincidence or closeness of positions on many urgent problems of a global nature are favorable preconditions for lending dynamism to and expanding mutually advantageous cooperation between the USSR and France. France rated highly the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and takes a positive attitude to the talks on a 50-percent reduction in offensive arms while complying with the ABM Treaty and renouncing the militarization of space. Paris advocates the adoption of an international convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons and a reduction in conventional arms on the continent. The Soviet concept of the common European home is also close to France. There is also mutual understanding between our countries with regard to resolving a number of regional conflicts.

At the same time it has to be pointed out that France advocates preserving the policy of nuclear deterrence in Europe, believing that under present conditions there is no alternative to it as an instrument for preventing war. A program is being implemented to build up the French strategic nuclear potential. France's Armed Forces now have 292 nuclear warheads, including 96 ballistic missiles on 6 nuclear-powered submarines, 18 intermediate-range missile silos, and 18 bombers. This potential will double by the mid-nineties. France is one of the initiators in re-animating the Western European Union and turning it into "NATO's European mainstay." Certain circles are also pushing the idea of creating a "European army," and the mixed Franco-West German brigade created this year is called its prototype. Paris' positions with regard to the U.S. SDI are contradictory too. While criticizing it, the French Government does not prevent French firms from getting involved in SDI work. The idea is also being nurtured of creating independent military space structures jointly with other West European countries. Of course, such actions cannot fail to arouse concern in the progressive public. And I believe that they will be a topic of discussion at the Soviet-French summit meeting to be held in a few days' time.

'New Political Dynamism' Foreseen

LD0207111989 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 2 Jul 89

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—There are sound grounds to believe that the official visit by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to France, which will start on Tuesday [4

July], will give new political dynamism to relations between the two countries and will elevate them to a qualitatively higher level.

After some hitch in the early 1980s, Soviet-French cooperation enters now a new round of development. This was largely promoted by the visit of Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to Paris last October and the Soviet visit by French President Francois Mitterrand in November 1988. During these meetings, pivotal for bilateral relations, the sides, confirmed that both Moscow and Paris attach much importance to deeper relations in the political, economic and humanitarian spheres and to broader cooperation in the international arena.

The sides revealed a considerable compatibility of Soviet and French priorities at the present stage of the disarmament process and readiness for joint political actions. Confidence emerged that substantial cuts in troops and conventional weapons, prohibition of chemical arms and elimination of their stockpiles fully meet the interests of the two countries. The Soviet and French positions are also close with respect to overcoming several regional conflicts, for instance, in the Middle East and Kampuchea.

Soviet and French thoughts about Europe's future are of the same nature. The two countries see its construction on the basis of understanding the community of European states and peoples. Incidentally, this community should be not only geographical but also political, economic and cultural.

Its reserves are great with respect to bilateral cooperation. Soviet-French economic relations do not conform either to possibilities or wishes of the two countries. The present practices—the mechanism of simple trade—do not meet the present-day imperatives. New forms of business contacts should be evidently used more boldly: establishment of joint ventures and direct contacts between Soviet and French firms, industrial cooperation. A transfer to a qualitatively new cooperation in the cultural and humanitarian spheres is also urgently needed.

Soviet diplomatic quarters believe that the visit by Mikhail Gorbachev to France will give a powerful impetus to settling these and many other questions. He will visit France for the first time as head of the Soviet state.

Paris Press Center Opens Prior to Gorbachev Visit

LD0107141889 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Text] Paris June 30 TASS—The Soviet press centre set up in connection with the upcoming official visit to France by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev started its work in the French capital today with a news conference devoted to "the Congress of People's Deputies and prospects for Soviet perestroika." A group of people's deputies and well-known public figures replied to journalists' questions. They concentrated on the results of the Congress of People's Deputies, the work of the ongoing session of the USSR Supreme Soviet (inner parliament), social, economic, nationalities and some other problems. It was pointed out that there was no alternative to perestroika.

Speakers noted that new political thinking is the driving force in restructuring the Soviet foreign policy. It is based on realism in the appraisal of the possibilities of the Soviet Union and the surrounding world. Of much importance is unity of words and deeds in the international arena, the fact that global problems of the present-day world overstep national borders and limits of social systems.

Zagladin Speaks at Press Center

LD0307162589 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 3 Jul 89

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Paris July 3 TASS—The coming Soviet-French summit meeting will witness the signing of a record-high number of agreements on the development of cooperation in various spheres. There will be some 20 of them, which is without precedent in the history of bilateral relations. This has been reported at a briefing held here at the Soviet press centre. The coordinated documents are the result of enormous preparatory work and of joint efforts. However, acccording to Vadim Zagladin, adviser to the president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, this is the level that has already been achieved. The task facing the leaders of the two countries today is to move forward and to put to effective use all the channels of bilateral relations, including political, economic, scientific and cultural ones.

It is also important that the Soviet-French dialogue and the accumulated experience of political and business relations can consolidate the trend of the departure from the East-West confrontation that emerged in Europe and become a real positive example on this way, speakers at the meeting pointed out. The Soviet-French dialogue is important for Europe for another reason as well. The stands of the two countries coincide on many issues, connected with the developments of the all-European process, and on regional conflicts.

Aleksandr Chubaryan, director of the Institute of World History under the USSR Academy of Sciences, spoke at the briefing about the importance of consolidating the historically formed traditions of mutual influence of the two nations' intellectual potentials. Public organisations of the two countries proved to be very useful in the development of such traditions. Speaking on their behalf, Valentina Tereshkova, president of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies, described these public organisations as a kind of people's staffs that promote the restructuring process in Europe and speed up the transfer from military rivalry to a large-scale cooperation of European nations.

Many questions were put to USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut Aleksandr Volkov. They dealt both with the recent Soviet-French space mission and with practical results of cooperation in this sphere. He said that as a result of the latest space expeditions to the Mir orbital station valuable materials had been brought to Earth, specifically, super-pure medical preparations and crystals for the electronic industry grown in conditions of weightlessness. Volkov expressed confidence that an agreement on Soviet-French cooperation in space exploration for the coming five years prepared by today would promote progress in both countries in the sphere of public health, electronics and communication.

Journalists who attended the briefing focused their attention on questions connected with the perestroika process in the USSR, with its economic situation and the reform of its political system. The briefing was held in a frank and open atmosphere. Speakers at the briefing set forth in detail the characteristic features of the situation formed in Soviet society. This means that the rear of the international sphere of Soviet perestroika, including the Soviet-French dialogue which is an important part of it, is being strengthened.

Gerasimov Briefs Journalists

LD0407082189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] A briefing has been held at the Soviet press center in Paris. Journalists were told that during the forthcoming Soviet-French summit about 20 agreements on the development of cooperation in various spheres—a record number in the history of bilateral cooperation—will be signed. It is also important, it was stressed at the briefing, that the Soviet-French dialigue and accumulated experience of political and business relations, can strengthen the trend away from East-West confrontation that has started in Europe, and become a real and positive example in this direction.

All the same, the main attention of the journalists at the briefing, which was conducted by Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, was focused on matters connected with the present restructuring in the Soviet Union. Participants in the press conference set forth in detail the particular features of the situation which have arisen in this difficult transitional period for Soviet society.

Mitterrand Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit

LD0407012689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1748 GMT on 3 July broadcasts an interview with French President Francois Mitterrand by Soviet TV correspondent Potapov. The date and place of the recorded interview are not given.

Potapov opens the interview by asking Mitterrand what he sees as the role of top-level diplomacy and personal contacts between himself and Gorbachev in the dialogue between the two countries. Mitterrand replies that such dialogue is "irreplaceable" and then lists his previous meetings with Gorbachev. He welcomes the upcoming visit and thinks frequent meetings with Soviet leaders are something to be pursued.

Potapov asks what sort of issues will be raised at the summit. Mitterrand mentions disarmament as a main issue and welcomes the new international move toward disarmament. "So far there is only one really functioning agreement concerning medium-range missiles. The double zero-option on missiles is very positive, and I immediately approved it. I think that priority should now be given to conventional weapons. An exchange of views is now under way on this issue. Proposals have been made by both sides. It seems to me that President Bush's latest proposals have met with a positive response in the Soviet Union. And we, for our part, have also done a certain amount toward bringing the existing standpoints closer together at the negotiations taking place, and we are striving to fully promote the success of these negotiations."

He says he is satisfied with the Paris conference on chemical weapons and sees progress but also the need for much more discussion in the sphere of reducing strategic weapons. "Then there is the discussion on short-range nuclear weapons. The latest decision adopted at the NATO session in Brussels seems sensible to me. Only from 1992, will we feel the real need for the modernization of such weapons and diplomacy must get down to work without delay so that neither side has any intention of over-arming itself, all the more so because the main striving today is for disarmament. This is an altogether important topic that will occupy a certain amount of time at the upcoming conversations in Paris."

Mitterrand then says he sees the development of the European process as the second main topic of the talks. After summing up EEC cooperation with other parts of the world, he points out that there is another Europe, of the Warsaw Pact and the CEMA. He approves of Gorbachev's conception of the common European home and this topic will also be discussed, as will world economics and the settlement of regional conflicts.

Asked about the prospects for the Vienna talks on disarmament, Mitterrand reiterates his support for Bush's proposals and says that given the will, things can be settled in a few months.

Potapov then asks how top-level meetings affect relations between France and the USSR in practice. Mitterrand says that bilateral relations have not developed as actively as hoped. "We have suffered as a result of the imbalance in our trade links and definite efforts must be made in this area in the immediate future, but I think that willingness to make these efforts is evident on both sides." He welcomes the progress in relations over the

last 1 ½ years but thinks it should be speeded up. Mitterrand recalls recent cultural links, including his meeting with the Soviet cosmonauts. He says that in general relations are good but not developing actively enough. Mitterrand recalls his Eureka technological project and the many resulting contracts. Unfortunately no East European countries are participating in the project. The joint Soviet-French space flight was a fine example of technological cooperation. Mitterrand asserts that the existing progress in increasing and improving relations shows that cooperation is possible and should be expanded. Ecology is a good example of a common problem to be jointly solved.

Asked whether he thinks people in the West see any progress in humanitarian cooperation within the development of the Helsinki process, Mitterrand says: "We must reach agreement not only on economics and security. We are now talking about trust, and trust will exist only if we turn our attention to a number of general principles and among them is respect for the rights of the individual and the exchange of ideas. In short, we must destroy the walls which divide us. Take, for example, the Berlin wall, in both the symbolic and practical sense, and in general all those walls that are erected here and there whether they are walls of stone or barbed wire, or ideological walls. This has to be changed. And everything that is done in this area, that will permit free crossing and free exchange, will be a good thing. Each side will benefit from this."

Mitterrand notes the increasing mutual interest between the French and the Soviet peoples. The historical ties between the two countries from a good basis for the future. "I believe that there will be no genuine links without democracy. I have no intention whatsoever of forcing our interpretation of democracy on such countries as the Soviet Union, but the efforts within the framework of restructuring aimed at bringing people greater freedom, giving state institutions greater flexibility, while at the same time ensuring greater control and balance, such efforts are moving in the direction of democracy. People need freedom in order to live and create, and they must be granted it."

Mitterrand supports the holding of a conference on humanitarian issues in Moscow because he believes Gorbachev's determination in this area is evident and to be supported.

In conclusion, Mitterrand hopes that Gorbachev will be able to visit France many times in order to get to know the French and travel to other parts of the country.

Views Changes in Europe, Prospects

PM0407101989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with French President F. Mitterrand by special correspondents I. Golembiovskiy and Yu. Kovalenko in Paris: "Jointly Preparing the Europe of the 21st Century. French President Francois Mitterrand Answers Questions From IZVESTIYA Special Correspondents"—date not given]

[Text] [IZVESTIYA] Mr President! You gave your first interview to IZVESTIYA 18 months ago, and this is now your second meeting with our newspaper's readers. It coincides with the celebrations to mark the 200th anniversary of the great French Revolution. Which ideas of the revolution—which have had an enormous impact on subsequent world development—are most valuable nowadays?

[Mitterrand] Indeed, the ideas of the French Revolution have spread far beyond the bounds of our country. They inspired and still inspire hope in those whose rights are threatened. It took a lot of time for the great principles of 1789—the sovereignty of the people, equal rights for citizens, and liberty guaranteed by law—to be shaped and affirmed. They still need constant vigilant attention today, for they are the foundation of democracy.

The great French 19th century writer Victor Hugo wrote: "The new revolution produced more promised land than conquered territory." That, precisely, is the topical aspect of the 200th anniversary of the French Revolution, which France is celebrating this year together with the international community.

The struggle to liberate mankind is far from over. Moreover, the serious deterioration in the state of the atmosphere today threatens mankind's very existence. The protection of the atmosphere requires solidarity and analysis of the experience of all nations. That is why now that we are honoring the revolution and its ideals I am appealing to people's reason and wisdom.

[IZVESTIYA] M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France is beginning. There have been notable improvements and gratifying changes in international policy since his first visit here in 1985. Your assessment of these changes and of the current atmosphere in Europe and worldwide would be very interesting.

[Mitterrand] There have been positive changes since Mr Gorbachev's first visit. There is a tendency for conflicts to abate, arms reductions have begun, democracy is expanding, and freedom is being asserted. I find this gratifying.

In the Soviet Union itself the appearance of elective forms of rule, the orientation toward a rule-of-law state, and the start of extensive popular debates all promote the reduction of differences between the existing systems in East and West. In this respect these changes can only be welcomed and I hope that they bring the expected results.

The new conditions bring with them new responsibility. The USSR and France have always played a special role in maintaining the equilibrium on which peace in Europe rests. Since everything is once again in a state of flux now, we will have to ensure that from now on the stability of states is accompanied by the freedom of the peoples. Just as the Franco-German reconciliation has become the foundation and cornerstone of the EC, so a new avenue in international relations can only promote rapprochement between the two Europes.

And my activities—recent trips to Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland, and in the next few months to the GDR and Hungary—serve the same aim: to outline the contours of tomorrow's Europe, in which there will be more freedom, more unity, and more solidarity.

[IZVESTIYA] During your visit to Moscow last year you supported the idea of a "common European home." How do things stand with regard to its implementation, in your opinion? What could the Soviet Union and France do to implement this idea?

[Mitterrand] The common European home is taking on a concrete complexion before our very eyes. It is still far from being reality, but is already more than a metaphor.

Look at what is happening in the two parts of Europe. In the West 12 nations which had long been rivals have undertaken to build a united community unprecedented in history and numbering 320 million inhabitants. This strong and flourishing community free to make its own choices is a chance for all of Europe.

The Eastern states—not to the same extent, admittedly—are opening up for a free exchange of ideas. These countries' adherence to democratic values will make and is already making them privileged partners of the community states.

We need to remove obstacles and build bridges between the two halves of Europe, which are naturally striving for rapprochement.

You are aware of these obstacles. They have been inherited from the half-century of fear and distrust that continues to prevail over us today. They include the unprecedented stockpiling of arms, walls dividing people, and tyranny that suppresses the law. Revealing and discussing them at international forums in which representatives of all European countries participate—such as the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces and the Paris CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension—is a substantial achievement in itself.

Thus, we should jointly prepare the Europe of the 21st century. Our children will be living in it, so let's expand youth exchanges. New dangers await us, so let's agree on how to protect our environment. The preservation of our national character will depend on the development of advanced technology, so let's develop a single television standard.

Those are the areas of work which I have already discussed with Mr Gorbachev. His answers inspired me. The time has come to build a Europe which will be obedient to our will in place of the Europe obedient to the vagaries of chance that we inherited from the past.

[IZVESTIYA] The disarmament process has become a reality these days. The gap is closing between the Western and Eastern positions—albeit more slowly than I would have liked—at least in their understanding of the need to speed up this process. How could France contribute to its further development and what does it intend to contribute?

[Mitterrand] Everyone is beginning to acknowledge—and I believe that this is long overdue—that security can be ensured at a lower level of arms, provided they are balanced. France, which has always abided by the principle of minimum sufficiency in this sphere, is delighted by this development of events and is contributing to the disarmament cause.

We are taking part in the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces. That is a top-priority task. It is in this sphere that we must concentrate our efforts in order to put an end to the dangerous imbalances and overarming.

The Warsaw Pact countries' reaction to the Western proposals illustrates that the gap is closing between our positions. I would like President Bush's proposal, which he put forward at the NATO summit at the end of May and which supplemented previous Western proposals, to meet with a positive response. That will make it possible to speed up the process that has begun and make further progress. That is why I supported this proposal.

Our country has also shown determination to promote progress in the chemical weapons sphere. On France's initiative the Conference on Banning the Use of Chemical Weapons was held in Paris. This conference culminated in success since the countries of the entire world spoke there of their determination to adopt a convention in the shortest possible timeframe to ban the development, production, stockpiling, and use of all types of chemical weapon and to destroy these weapons. The Geneva talks have been resumed with France's assistance.

Things are different in the strategic arms sphere. The United States and the Soviet Union have resumed bilateral talks and that is very good. However, considering the inequality of the arsenals, France can only join these talks after the conditions I set out in 1983 at the UN General Assembly have been fulfilled. It would be unreasonable today to compare the level of arms sufficient for ensuring France's defense with the level of Soviet or U.S. arms.

[IZVESTIYA] The dynamics and volumes of Soviet-French economic cooperation clearly lag behind the level of political dialogue between the two states. In your opinion, Mr President, what are the reasons for this situation? What steps may be taken to increase mutual trade? And to expand economic contacts altogether?

[Mitterrand] Our economic relations are not insignificant. The USSR is one of France's main suppliers of power resources and by and large our country holds fourth place for purchases from and is sixth among

Western countries for deliveries to the USSR. Nevertheless the scale of our economic ties is still extremely modest since the volume of our trade with your country amounts to only 1 percent of France's overall exports.

The slowdown in our economic cooperation that was recorded until last year when it increased once again quite drastically is partially attributable to the fact that our cooperation was geared toward major projects in those sectors of the economy which maybe no longer accord with the USSR's immediate requirements. That is why I believe we must strengthen our cooperation in traditional spheres such as power engineering, chemistry, agriculture, and the food industry but also diversify it in view of the reforms being implemented in the USSR. Our firms will, undoubtedly, be able to benefit from the process of developing mixed enterprises, which accords with Mr Gorbachev's wishes. Incidentally, France is third after the FRG and Finland in terms of the number of mixed enterprises it has in your country.

Mr Gorbachev's visit to France will help improve and strengthen the structure of this cooperation due to the projected signing of numerous intergovernmental agreements, in particular, regarding the protection and mutual encouragement of capital investments.

Dumas Comments on Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit
LD0307064289 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 3 TASS—The forthcoming state visit to France by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev is of exceptional importance, Roland Dumas, French minister of state and minister of foreign affairs, said in the programme of the Europe-1 radio station Sunday night.

Preparations for the Soviet-French summit have been made rather constructively, he pointed out. With great facility we prepared a basis for talks on political, economic and social problems.

The French foreign minister recalled that more than twenty bilateral agreements on various problems—expansion of youth exchanges, cultural cooperation, the training of personnel and so on—are to be signed during the visit.

Touching upon disarmament issues which will become one of the main subjects during the forthcoming summit, Dumas emphasised that Paris intended to show a "reasonable approach." The disarmament process should not be slowed down now. However, one should not lose vigilance either, he pointed out.

Dumas again confirmed that "the question of making French nuclear strike forces the subject of the talks on disarmament is not being raised now."

Speaking of the state of affairs in the Soviet Union, Dumas pointed out that the USSR now encounters certain difficulties. However, the style of Gorbachev's leadership inspires hopes and optimism that the forthcoming difficulties will be overcome, he stressed.

Shevardnadze Talks With French Envoy in Moscow
LD0107192489 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received France's new ambassador to the Soviet Union, Jean Marie Merillon, on Saturday. They discussed intensive efforts from both sides to prepare the forthcoming Soviet-French summit in Paris.

The summit is to confirm the traditional, stable nature of the Soviet-French dialogue and give a new impetus to further development and deepening of mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries in the interests of consolidation of positive tendencies in Europe and the rest of the world.

North Atlantic Assembly Group Arrives in Moscow
LD0207211889 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 2 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—A delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly headed by the organisation's leader Patrick Duffy arrived at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow today.

Ryzhkov Receives Delegation
LD0407212589 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov met a delegation from the North-Atlantic Assembly (NAA) led by president Patrick Duffy here today, to discuss a wide range of questions of mutual interest.

Nikolay Ryzhkov told the NAA delegation about profound changes that have swept all spheres of life in Soviet society. The guests took a keen interest in the processes of renewal going on in the Soviet political, social and economic life, and democratisation and glasnost.

When discussing global issues, both sides showed mutual desire to stabilise the international situation, improve East-West relations, and develop a conceptual dialogue for a more stable and safer world.

Ryzhkov informed the visitors about priorities in Soviet social and economic development first set at the April 1985 Plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and further defined at the recent Congress of People's Deputies.

The prime minister described specific problems of Soviet economic development, the country's share in the world economy, and ways of overcoming current economic difficulties and expanding international trade.

The delegates were informed about Soviet defence spending cuts, and conversion of military industries for peaceful production to solve social and economic tasks.

Members of the NAA delegation said they were satisfied by the talks, praised a frank and constructive spirit of the meeting and wished the Soviet Government success in its work for the well-being of the Soviet people and efforts to expand contacts with other countries.

Political & Social

3 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

Gorbachev's Introductory Remarks

LD0407150689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Excerpts] As has already been reported, the USSR Supreme Soviet session has been continuing in the Kremlin today. We are now broadcasting relayed recordings of today's sitting of the session. [passage omitted]

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Good day, comrades. By 0900 429 deputies had registered.

You must bear in mind that life goes on—as does work. The Lithuanian delegation has left six people behind, while the others are taking part in proceedings there, where a session is taking place. And so, we must use our forces to advantage here. There are others here as proxies. Some of the comrades are ill. One must assume that some will be ill. As it happens we will return to this matter. It has been studied on the basis of the instructions of the Supreme Soviet. We will start with that and hold consultations. But now allow me to declare this sitting of our session open.

Before moving onto the agenda, I want to tell you, dear comrades, that Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko passed away yesterday. I would ask you to honor his memory. [shuffling, then silence for a few seconds]

There is no need for me to talk about Andrey Andreyevich. It will probably be said in good time. You all knew the man. His whole life was bound up with the whole history, all the achievements, all the problems, and everything. This man was for decades always in the thick of things. Even though in recent times Andrey Andreyevich was retired, and even though he was recently released from his duties in the Central Committee at his own request, nevertheless we think it would be fitting for the Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the government to issue a statement to the people and to do everything necessary so that our people could bid him farewell. Evidently that's what we should do, yes? [shouts of "that's right" from the hall]

I should like to begin this sitting by taking your advice. Last week we finalized the committees and commissions. We resolved a number of current issues, and confirmed eight deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, the minister of foreign affairs, and the USSR Council of Ministers' administrator of affairs. We still have to examine the candidacies of three deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers, 34 ministers, and 13 chairmen of state committees. In all, 50 people. Then the candidates to make up the Committee of People's Control, the Supreme Court, the Collegium of the Procurator's Office, and the USSR State Board of Arbitration. That is a further 150 people.

We have determined that the old Council of Ministers will retain its power until the confirmation of a new government. But as in restructuring, we now have both new and old.

So what am I driving at? I am giving you information to mull over. That's a well-known expression. Clearly, we have to forge ahead with greater perseverance to get to the end of this process. I am always in favor of the approach that any advance should not be at the expense of quality, interest, or exactitude. Instead, quite simply, we must get at what is most important for a clear understanding and at what determines the standpoint of a contender for a post. We should leave aside for the moment those questions and instructions that comrade deputies might have on certain problems, and that they want raised or implemented. What I seem to be saying is that we now need to concentrate on this and open up the opportunities for the government to work.

Comrades have said that not all the ministers need to sit here while we confirm some of them. The others could go on working. That might well be the case, but I doubt if there would be any great advantage in this. The main thing is that we have to complete this process. Therefore, I would again ask you to collate your questions, make a list of them—I've asked you to do this already—so that the most important points can be elicited from the contenders, and then we can move on.

I believe you already have 10 or so bills of law in your hands. At any rate, those were the instructions that were issued, so you'll be receiving them. In the next couple of days—either today or tomorrow, I should think—you will get another bill of law on local government. A very important law that is quite essential. So, your briefcases are already bulging with new documents in store for you and that you and I need to discuss and get to the bottom of. This, too, obliges us to be more rational in the way we use the working time of the Supreme Soviet. Presumably this is a special feature of the first congress and the first Supreme Soviet because we are putting things together. Many things have been undertaken but not yet completed, and so we have to work more vigorously and actively.

As a guide we can say that we should complete the formation of the government this week. [murmurs of discontent] And what if we add night sittings? [more murmurs, Gorbachev laughs] You're even prepared to agree to that! No, all the same I believe that if we follow the suggestion—the advice—that I gave at the start, there will be no need for this. And I believe the work should be more rational, otherwise the deputies will not have the chance of working on the documents or of meeting specialists and experts, and so on. Our main Standing Orders must be adhered to, but the questions must be focused, so to speak. But anyway, as a guide we could say that we should finish forming the government this week. What about it, comrades? [calls of 'Yes'] Yes.

One more thing. The last matter was the instructions of the Supreme Soviet on how we should pass decisions in the Supreme Soviet. This problem arose when we did not have the two-thirds of the total number of deputies in the USSR Supreme Soviet required to confirm a candidate. There has been some work performed on this issue. The chairmen of the committees and commissions have worked on it along with the chairman of the chambers.

Yevgeniy Pavlovich, can you make your report now? Yes? Go ahead.

[Unidentified voice] It's Velikhov who's Yevgeniy Pavlovich.

[Gorbachev] Oh, I'm sorry, Yevgeniy Maksimovich [Primakov]. Velikhov is sitting beside you and stops me concentrating. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Yazov Addresses 3 Jul Session

LD0307223489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Speech by USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, with interjections by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev; from a recorded relay of the 3 July Supreme Soviet proceedings]

[Text] [Gorbachev] Now, comrades, we have agreed to examine jointly the issue of appointing the USSR Defense Minister. A proposal has been put forward, and Comrade Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov is proposed. The Committee for Defense and State Security Questions has recommended that Comrade Yazov be confirmed and appointed to that office. Go ahead, please, Dmitriy Timofeyevich. Yes. There, on the right-hand side, some of the questions are to Comrade Mostovoy. You can ignore them.

[Yazov] Esteemed comrades! In contrast to other ministries, the organizational development of the Armed Forces, the military doctrine, and international relations are determined not by the Ministry of Defense but by the supreme political leadership of the country. In this connection, the Defense Ministry develops the forms and methods of implementing decisions by the supreme political leadership through developing forms and methods and their implementation through developing operational, mobilization and other plans of using arms of the Armed Forces, services and special troops. [sentence as heard]

Reduction of the Armed Forces, drafts, and other measures associated with organizational development are also determined by the political leadership of the country.

You are aware of the recent publication of a decree of the Supreme Soviet Presidium on nonenlistment of students for compulsory military service. A decision of the country's Defense Council was followed by the publication of the Supreme Soviet decree. What does it amount to, for the Armed Forces and the country, not to call up students? Not to call them up means not to call up 340,000 students of higher education establishments and 30,000 students of secondary education establishments. That has become possible as a result of the decision to cut down the Armed Forces personnel by 500,000 men. Had that reduction never taken place, it would not have been possible to refrain from calling up the students, for it would have led to a significant shortage of men in the Armed Forces.

Many people are now raising the question of freeing the students on active military service. At the present moment 176,000 students called up in 1987 and 1988 are on active military service. Roughly half of the questions from deputies to the Minister of Defense wonder whether it is not possible to let the students called up in 1987 and 1988 go early. I would reply that those 176,000 students are a very highly trained part of the Armed Forces. They have undergone training in training subunits and are section commanders, commanders of tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, and guns. In other words, 176,000 of the junior officer corps would be discharged, and that would undoubtedly have an effect on the combat readiness of the armed forces.

Any decision could be made, but I would ask you to bear this in mind: At the present moment there is no possiblity of discharging these comrades, and they must do the length of service that is laid down by the law.

A great many questions were submitted to me, connected with the possibility of servicemen doing their military service on the territory where they were born. Comrades from the Baltic republics, Moldavia, and Georgia are asking these questions.

I would ask all comrade deputies to appraise the situation. If every serviceman serves on the territory of the republic where he was born, then one can ask the question: And who will serve in the Western Group of Forces? This is the group of Soviet forces in Germany which has now been renamed the Western Group of Forces. Who will serve in the Central Group of Forces, or in the Southern and in the Northern? The question is a logical one, and the answer is a logical one.

Second question: Who will serve in the Stategic Missile Forces? Or in the Air Force? In the final analysis, who will serve in the Northern and Pacific Ocean Fleets, which are the main strike force of our Armed Forces?

I think that such a formulation of questions is impermissible. It is another matter that some units of personnel called upon from these republics should serve on the territory of these republics in order to have a trained contingent of personnel for the deployment of those subunits which, according to the mobilization plan, will be deployed there.

The next section of questions which has come in to me concerns construction units and subunits. You know that construction units, road units, and railway troops are all involved in helping the fulfillment of national economic tasks. If you adopt a decision that there should not be such units, it will only be better and easier for the Ministry of Defense. But I would not like to proceed along such a line so that things should be easier for us. At the moment we are building roads in the Non-Chernozem Zone; 22 teams have been formed. Are roads needed or not, one asks. Yes, they are. But who can build roads at this time in places where there are very few people? Obviously some kind of organized force, and if you agree, then at all events the Army is a sufficiently well-organized force and it has successfully undertaken the resolving of this very difficult task.

In the most deserted places it is necessary to build other roads, too, including railways. Who will build them but the military? The railway corps is busy with this problem, and I'll tell you that they are working pretty successfully. This can be cited on the example which was given to us by the earthquake in Armenia; 30-plus kilometers of railways which were put out of action, and which at the epicenter sank by 7 meters. The railwaymen fulfilled this work literally in a week.

As far as discipline in construction detachments is concerned—many questions on this have come in—undoubtedly one would like it to be at a higher level. We are busy with these issues. Zonal political departments have been created, which are busy, but so far, unfortunately, we cannot assign an officer to every platoon of construction subunits. Warrant officers or compulsory service sergeants are working there. Very regrettably, we also call up into the construction units more than 100,000 of those who have already spent certain periods in jail, and naturally they bring certain prison ways and certain undesirable factors to the construction units.

But we are working on it and consider it our duty to do everything we can to ensure that no one in the construction units is humiliated, insulted, or offended. Naturally, there are criminals whom we punish and who should bear responsibility.

The following group of questions is connected with the publication of the new service regulations. I would like to report to the Supreme Soviet that the new service regulations have been drawn up, already taking into account the new political structure, and taking into account the Congress of People's Deputies and the election of the Supreme Soviet. These service regulations will be published from the 10 through 20 July in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA for nationwide discussion and above all for discussion throughout the Army. We have decided not to publish all the service regulations, but to take the main ones: the interior service regulations within the service, the disciplinary reglations, and the manual of garrison and guard duties, in that part where they deal with mutual relations between garrisons and the officers of the garrison duty and the local party and soviet bodies.

In accordance with the new defense doctrine that we are carrying out and implementing, we have worked out the bases of the groundwork for conducting strategic, front, and Army operations, and we have drawn up the field manuals in which all the questions connected with the defense doctrine are posed as priority questions. In the first place are Front Army defensive operations, followed by counteroffensives, and others. From a theoretical point of view, all these questions have been reflected in those documents that I have mentioned to you.

The most complicated question, which elicited many enquiries, concerned discharging officers in connection with the reductions in the Armed Forces. The 500,000-man reductions in the Armed Forces naturally will affect the fates of approximately 500,000 men, and especially the families of officers. We have approached this in an informal manner and continue to do so. You know that we withdrew the 40th Army from Afghanistan, and there was not a single complaint from the officers made to the government or other bodies who could have complained that we had not made arrangements or found posts for them, and so forth. All the officers, 100 percent of them, who were withdrawn from Afghanistan, have been reestablished and posts have been found for them. The number of personnel who were to be discharged have been discharged. Incidentally, in spite of the statement by the mujahidin that we would organize a bloodbath in withdrawing the 40th Army, this bloodbath did not come about for them. I report that we withdrew the 40th Army virtually without losses. Eight people perished, and those as a result of accidents, avalanches, and so forth.

As far as the discharge of 500,000 men is concerned, approximately 60,000 officers will be discharged having served out their set term of service, and in practice they will be provided with a pension, and many of them have an apartment. Naturally, not all of them have an apartment, especially those who are serving in the north, in the Far East, on Chukotka Peninsula. We shall have to seek out those apartments. We are applying to the local soviets of people's deputies, and we are applying to the directors of enterprises who will be building housing now, to help us provide accommodation for officers who have been discharged, albeit on a basis of mutual assistance.

We are also appealing to the directors of enterprises who are now going to be involved in housing construction to help us, at least on a reciprocal basis, provide the officers who are being discharged with housing. The Defense Ministry made a decision, and that decision is already being implemented, and 100 houses are under construction expressly for the officer personnel who are going to be discharged in the nearest future.

What is the situation like with reduction? We have withdrawn two divisions from the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany, a tank division from the Southern Group of Troops, and we have withdrawn all airborne brigades and battalions. At the moment, we are withdrawing pontoon units. All that is being conducted in strict accordance with the schedule.

We report promptly to the government, the Defense Council, on the reduction of the Armed Forces, and I believe that the strength will be reduced by about 250,000 personnel this year, and the second half of the personnel will be cut next year. Well, as far as the personnel is concerned, we just don't call them up and we do not bring up to strength the formations and units which need to be brought up to strength. That is why, to an extent [sighs] there is a growing shortage of men in the Armed Forces, and the staffing level to date is 94 percent.

As regards the reduction of medium and short-range missiles. You know that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Reagan signed an agreement in December 1987, eliminating the medium and short-range missiles. We are scrapping 1886 missiles; the Americans are scrapping a somewhat smaller number. We have been observing the elimination schedule strictly, and the Americans are also doing it strictly according to the schedule. Seven U.S. commissions are present at our destruction sites and at the works which used to turn out these missiles. Accordingly, our groups are also present at the U.S. works and testing ranges. On that plane, they have no complaints to make to us, nor have we to them.

Regarding a number of other issues associated with reducing the Armed Forces and armaments, I would like to report that out of the 10,000 tanks which we are to withdraw from the western part of the Soviet Union, we have withdrawn 3,500 to date. We have withdrawn 760 guns, and 41 aircraft. A part of these tanks is used to rearm the troops in the eastern okrugs and the central zone, a part of the tanks is mothballed, and the old tanks made in the 1950's and the 1960's are destroyed.

Now about the issues associated with mobilization arrangements. Comrade Veprev and a number of others asked questions related to those issues.

We have given orders not to call anybody to any kind of assemblies during the period of haymaking and harvesting periods, but to conduct assemblies, in agreement with local soviets of people's deputies, in wintertime or at a time when there is no intensive work in agriculture, although there is always intense work in industry.

Very many questions have come to me, and continue to come, connected with the resolving of some kind of specific personal questions. If you permit, I'll give concrete answers to such questions, to literally each person.

To what extent do cuts in defense expenditure in our country correspond to defense expenditure in the West? This question was asked by Comrade Lubenchenko, a people's deputy. I would like to say that the reduction of our military expenditure is connected with the unilateral reductions to the Soviet Armed Forces by 500,000 men, as I have already said. In the NATO bloc military expenditure constantly increases every year by 3 percent. Recently Thatcher stated that they are cutting the Armed Forces by 10 percent, but at the same time she said that all the same they are increasing expenditure on weapons by 3 percent.

In the state budget the share of our expenditure comes to 15.6 percent; in the United States it is 27.2 percent. The share in the gross national product in our country is 8.4 percent, while in the United States it is 5.6 percent. Per head of the population we spend R270; in the United States per head of the population they spend $1,300. As you can see, it is several times more.

I had several questions connected with how much we spend per 100,000, per million, but if I have said R270 per head of the population, while over there it is $1,300, I think that it will not be difficult to calculate.

Comrades asked the question: In absolute figures, how many people are there in the Army? Well, I think that it won't be a secret, Mikhail Sergeyevich...

[Gorbahcev] Go on.

[Yazov] ...if I say that following the reductions by 500,000 there will be 3.7 million persons remaining in our country in the Armed Forces. In the United States, including the National Guard, they have 3.65 million. In the FRG they have 500,000 persons in the Bundeswehr; in Britain there are 360,000; in France 480,000; and in China there are 3.7 million—but only if in that 3.7 million we count all construction troops. In China construction, rakuky, and other troops have been taken out from the parameters of the Armed Forces, and they are included in a civil ministry. What should I read first, the red or white ones? [laughter]

The second question which was asked earlier: Is our decision to cut defense expenditure appropriate to this specific historical time, and to the state of tension in world as a whole? I think that it is appropriate. You see, in the end you can have so many weapons, mountains of weapons, and you can become a prisoner of those weapons. Well, for example: We are destroying 3,000 nuclear warheads, together with medium- and shorter-range missiles. According to the treaty which continues to be observed at the present time, if we reach agreement on 50 percent cuts to strategic offensive weapons, then we must additionally cut 6,000 nuclear warheads; 3,000 and 6,000 are 9,000 nuclear warheads.

If one takes into account the fact that a nuclear warhead serves approximately 10 years, then this means that every 10 years they have to be changed, and this means that every year 900 nuclear warheads have to be made. This is an example of how we ourselves become the prisoners of our own weapons.

The more weapons there are, the greater need there is for storage depots. The more weapons there are, the greater need there is to have them serviced. And for this more personnel are needed. That is why I regard the decision to cut tanks in Europe by 10,000, to cut guns by 8,600, and to cut combat aircraft by 820 as a perfectly normal phenomenon.

Naturally, this will, to a certain extent, reduce the combat readiness of the Armed Forces, but we must perceive combat readiness not in an abstract way, but in accordance with a comparison with other states and blocs. If we compare the ratio today and bear in mind the fact that we are moving to a defensive doctrine, then the weapons and the numbers of troops which will remain are quite sufficient to deter an aggressor from a possible attack.

Does the process whereby the Army is rid of low-qualification military labor and whereby the Army life's scientific, technical, and intellectural level is enhanced require expenditure? Naturally, it does. The more highly qualified a soldier is, the more he does on his own, the more literate he is, and the better he is at manning equipment.

I would like to say in this connection that a great many people are raising the question of a professional Army, a paid Army. Let me say straightaway that we cannot afford a professional Army. The U.S. soldier who has enlisted voluntarily receives $1,000 a month. If what he gets for his family is taken into account—if the family is not working—then the soldier receives approximately $1,500. A sergeant gets about $2,000. Officers get some $4,000, and the minister gets $67,000. And I get 1,000 [rubles]!

[Gorbachev] To be precise, 1,100 [rubles]. [laughter] As a candidate member of the Politburo. No matter where he works, a member of the Politburo gets R1,200, a candidate member gets R1,100, and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee gets R1,000. But probably one should add to Comrade Yazov's earnings what he gets for his title of Army General.

[Yazov] As far as professionalism is concerned, comrades, our Army is also, after all, half professional. All our pilots on combat planes are officers; they are professionals. On submarines, 50 percent of tasks are carried out by officers or warrant officers, and there are literally only a few sailors who carry out unqualified work. After all, someone has to clean up, do the vacuuming, clear up. Naturally, there is no need for highly qualified, trained officers here. I think that the more skilled the work is, the greater is the combat readiness on these ships. At the moment we have submarines where the posts are filled only by officers and warrant officers. There are literally three or four people—ship's cooks, cleaners—who are sailors.

Would it not be rational in cutting down excessive forms of expenditure, to redistribute the funds released to improve defense systems? That all depends on the possibilities of the state. In my opinion, so to speak, it would naturally be better to use the R15 billion released for military science, but at the same time other questions have to be resolved as well. Therefore, as the Supreme Soviet decides, that is how it should be. I think that in this case we will only submit a request, and whatever amount you approve for the upkeep of the Armed Forces, for purchaes of armaments, that is how it should be.

How can one forget about the hundreds of servicemen's families who need to be provided with elementary conditions for living, with housing, work, and children's establishments? Under these conditions, they say, quite the opposite, greater expenditures are required. Respected comrades, we are living in our country, and by the standard of living of the entire people. We cannot demand more than the state can give. If we are talking about the family of each officer, naturally it would be desirable for officers to receive higher wages, taking into account that there may not be a job for their spouses everywhere. But in those places where the spouse cannot find a job, where the garrison is in a remote location, there we give the officers rations. There are also the corresponding wage increments. There are areas where the increment amounts to 15 percent; in high mountain areas, on the frontiers, the increment is as much as 40 percent; on Sakhalin and the Kurile islands the increment is as much as 50 percent; on the Chukotka Peninsula it is 100 percent; on Novaya Zemlya, 100 percent. So, to a certain extent, the figures have been worked out for all our regions, and taking into account the conditions, a monetary allowance is paid out to officers. There are undoubtedly regions where there are no schools, but we are building those schools. In some places there are no nursery schools, but we are building nursery schools. But the resolution of problems is evidently difficult in the Armed Forces, just as it is in the country as a whole.

By reducing military expenditure are we not submerging the final islet of our scientific-technical and intellectual potential, which is at the present time concentrated in the institutes and enterprises engaged in fulfilling military orders? We would like not to bury them; the main scientific research establishments in both the Army and the branch ministries remain, and only a certain portion of this scientific potential is being switched to the development of other types of civilian ministries.

Well, I know that the Ministry of Medium Machine-Building is developing cheesemaking and other lines and factories. I think that this is quite normal. Well, will it

tell or not? Of course, it will tell, to a certain degree. The United States has spent three times as much as us on the scientific development of the Armed Forces. But the United States, in general, spends four times as much as we do on maintaining armed forces. They have a different social system, and different conditions and potential over there. Therefore, I think that our main task is not to compare ourselves with the United States, Japan, or the Bundeswehr, but to solve the tasks assigned to us by supreme organs of state power, taking into consideration our own conditions and capabilities. Is it possible to transfer servicemen to the reserve ahead of schedule, by 1 September? I have already said that there are 176,000 of the best-trained servicemen, and if we transfer them to the reserve, the fighting efficiency will decrease to a considerable degree, and, as a rule, all these servicemen serve mainly abroad. The Siberian summer is very short—I have come to your question and I think I have answered it. We will take into account both the climatic conditions and the seasons for planning the call-up of conscripts for retraining in the future.

All economies have been transferred to financial autonomy and self-financing; who will compensate the expenses linked to the retraining of reservists and calls to military commissariats? We will try to reduce such call-ups but, at the same time, I have received a number of letters saying that people are called to military commissariats for some kind of registration and work. There have been no instructions of that sort from the Ministry of Defense; it seems to be an initiative of the military commissariats, and if there are such cases, we are now clarifying this, we will put them right, and I ask you to keep in mind that military commissariats have to carry out all their tasks using their own staff, and if someone is called, it is an illegal act.

What is the essence of the process of democratization in the Armed Forces? Well, given all the democratization in the Armed Forces, unity of command [yedinonachaliye] has been, is, and must be there. Without unity of command, the Armed Forces cannot exist. And democratization can be on a party basis as well. Public commissions have been set up in regiments and divisions, and they take part in attestation, examine personal reference written by the commander, and take part in the implementation of promotion in service and in a number of other cases.

Commanders—on our directive and recommendation, in any case—have started to look for more support in the work of party bodies. They consult Komsomol members, officers' assemblies have been set up, meetings of soldiers are being held more often, and soldiers have been given permission to address any commander, whereas earlier this could be done only with a mandatory permission of the section commander, through all stages, and so on. We see democratization in this, but there cannot be unlimited democratization in an Army, or else there will be no Army.

How will this process—meaning the reductions—affect the life of private soldiers and the officer corps? I think I have answered the main questions. For some this will be a painful process. We are not reducing the number of soldiers, but we are simply not calling them up, and a reduction is effected through that. The divisions that we withdraw we are disbanding. To great regret, nobody has complained so far about being discharged, but because there has been talk of or the process of talks on further reductions in the Armed Forces, a tendency has prevailed when officers, espcially young officers, write reports and wish to leave the service.

There was a question regarding whether or not officers and warrant officers are allowed to study in civil institutes. We allow this. But there was a proviso: preferably according to the speciality. For instance, if he is a maintenance mechanic, he ought to study in some technological, not pedagogical, institute. But this issue can be reconsidered. In any case, officers are not forbidden to improve their education.

Do you regard the social security of members of the families of servicemen as satisfactory and, if not, what do you think should be done, and what help could the Supreme Soviet give? I think that all servicemen are, first of all, citizens of the Soviet Union, and all servicemen have the same social security as everybody else. But are all satisfied or not? I think that not all. And taking into account the fact that every 5 years, or more often, the servicemen chages his place of residence, I think that not always is everybody happy.

But as regards social security, it is certainly there. Well, social security means, first of all, whether or not the officer and his family are well fed. I assure you that they are well provided for. Even this year, by using military transport aircraft with the permission of the Council of Ministers, we delivered cherries and strawberries to the most remote garrisons. Last autumn we delivered everything possible from Uzbekistan to the most remote garrisons. We have 83 military state farms and over 100 dairy farms. In the most remote garrisons, where there are children, we keep our cows, we bring cows by aircraft there, we bring hay there and make everything possible to keep children happy. But is everybody always well provided for everywhere? Well, of course, everything is not always all right everywhere.

There are posts where only one family lives. Can one keep a doctor there? Of course not—let alone keep a specialist there. Therefore, we keep helicopters on call and we bring women in childbirth by helicopters, and it happens sometimes that children are born in helicopters, too. Life is life, and it is difficult to forsee all situations and to work out some blueprint of social security to satisfy everybody.

I have a question on Vladivostok: When will Vladivostok become an open city? By the way, it is not a very closed city. This year alone, over 6 months, 39 foreign

delegations visited it and carried out programs of various events in the Far East. We need this, first of all, in order to know who comes there and from where; Vladivostok was formed and set up as a large naval base. The naval headquarters, the main moorage, and all the depots are situated there. All this should be removed, but to remove all this from there—we discussed all these questions with Vitaliy Ivanovich—R307 million are required, no more, no less. But considering that everybody is asking, I feel too shy, in this case, to ask for R307 million to remove the depots more quickly and to open Vladivostok.

I think that nobody will break his back if he calls, asks, or notifies, in any case, that a Japanese or another delegation is coming, and we will take all security measures. And let this delegation come, then—I have already said, 39 delegations have come this year, and 48 delegations visited last year. In my view, nobody hampers anybody.

Comrades, I have about 400 questions altogether.

[Gorbachev] You have 5 more minutes to answer your questions.

[Yazov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I would ask the esteemed comrades to let me collect these questions; we will examine each question individually and we will answer them. But the main questions related, first of all, with releasing students, with not calling students up, and with social security, I have answered.

Yazov Answers Deputies' Questions

LD0407000389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Question and answer session between USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov and USSR Supreme Soviet deputies; from a recorded relay of the 3 July Supreme Soviet proceedings]

[Text] [Piryazeva] My name is Pirayzeva, I am from Novosibirsk. I have asked you the following question: What do you think, which particular governmental body supervises the sales of weapons to other countries today? And who, in your view, should deal with it in the future? What I mean is, should these issues not be the prerogative of the Supreme Soviet? Thank you.

[Yazov] Our only body which is involved in the sales of weapons is the Foreign Economic Relations Ministry. They have a directorate which examines these issues. All issues associated with the sales of weapons are coordinated with the Defense Ministry and the Foreign Affairs Ministry. The appropriate decisions are taken, and as to the situation when someone decides to sell weapons to someone else, get money for that, etc—such a situation has never existed and does not exist. That's how it is.

[Gorbachev] And as regards the Supreme Soviet, what is your view?

[Yazov] Well, as regards the Supreme Soviet, I believe that the Supreme Soviet has a Defense and State Security Commission, and I think that these issues could be examined in that commission. Whether it is necessary or possible is for you to decide. I believe that it is both possible and necessary.

[Gorbachev] Very well....

[Indistinct interjection from the floor]

[Yazov] I did say, possible and necessary.

[Gorbachev] Go ahead, please.

[Khmura] Dmitriy Yefimovich—Deputy Khmura. I have the following question: Additional drafting is now in progress. I would like to draw your attention to the following point, for a great number of voters complain that we call up...[Khmura changes thought] above all, now, it is associated with the earthquake in Armenia—but then there is the second question—Dmitriy Yefimovich! And my second question has to do with the following. I believe that our children could cope in the Army with the following issue, but if you take the supplies and other things, it is the extended servicemen who are in charge of that. And they are the kind of people—and I believe it is true—who did not want to engage in labor and therefore stayed on in the Army. And I think that their numbers in that (?sinecure) ought to be cut down. Our children are capable of running the Army, of handling exactly the kind of issues that the extended servicemen deal with.

[Yazov] I understood the question. First, when the earthquake took place, no one estimated what was necessary and what was not. A commission was set up by the Politburo, headed by Nikolay Ivanovich [Ryzhkov], Council of Ministers chairman, and we immediately left on a flight there. It was night and on the same day the commission took a decision to deploy nine civil defense regiments immediately.

Comrades, had that not been done, had the 400 military transport aircraft not been used, comrades, we would have not been able to extract 30,000 people from under the rubble. We should bow to those who did it, saved 30,000 people, just imagine!

Well, regarding the present situation, whether it is necessary or not to keep the civil defense regiments for clearing the rubble, I believe the need for that still exists.

Regarding the question concerning the extended servicemen, I think you are right, we should not just accept those who express the wish but to select those who are necessary, and we are going to take your wish into account.

[Gorbachev] Go ahead, please.

[Mikheyev] Deputy Mikheyev.

[Gorbachev, replying to an unheard remark from the floor] No, it is my feeling that such essential issues which have been left unanswered—[they should] be clarified. I proceed from that. Go ahead please.

[Mikheyev] Deputy Mikheyev. What is being done to increase discipline? There is bullying, there have been instances of soldiers firing shots at each other. Apart from that, those accidents on the nuclear submarines, probably, involved [breaches of] discipline, too, and on top of that, planes land on Red Square. What do you have to say to that?

[Yazov, clearing his throat] Esteemed comrades, we grapple with discipline daily. Believe it or not, I keep myself informed of what is going in in the troops daily. Take today, for example. I have already been in touch with all military district commanders. We have sorted out the situation with discipline in June, in the past week, and, naturally, we do not see the incidents and crimes which still occur in the Armed Forces as some kind of achievement of ours.

Can one consider accidents on submarines to be violations of discipline? I would not ascribe this to indiscipline. Take the last accident; we have not yet gotten to the bottom of it. At present the temperature of the reactor is 67 degrees. One cannot get near it. The temperature is still high for the moment. The cooling process will end in about 1 or 1 ½ weeks. Only then will we discover where and why something burst, or something broke open. The same goes for the submarine which sank. You know that that submarine was made of titanium and was quite strong; it was well-made. But what happened? The submarine had been cruising for 3 months. In 3 months, something can happen. And it evidently did happen somewhere, bearings went out of action, a high temperature was created, and then it caught fire. In that compartment number seven there were seven regeneration cells. The submarine was on the move and in a normal condition all of the time. Then, for no apparent reason, the submarine suddenly began to fill with water, and it sank. Several explosions were heard. Evidently, these regeneration canisters [patron] exploded and the hull, or the hermetic seal of the hull, was upset, and it rapidly began to fill up with water. Neither pumps nor the other measures which were taken helped, and the submarine sank.

Of course everyone is worried about bullying [dedovshchina]. Perhaps I am the one who is most worried by it. However, I would like to say, comrades, that more discussion goes on about it than there are cases of it. Young soldiers who are just arriving [Yazov changes thought], I recently read a mother's letter: The soldier served 20 days and wrote four letters to his mother: I get beaten up so terribly, this and that; although he is still in a subunit where there are only young soldiers. They do their training alone, and none of the soldiers with longer service are allowed there. When the mother was invited in and they began investigating, well, they are simply homesick. When the lads are called up, they get homesick and write letters.

Comrades, do not raise objections, I tell you again that I have no intention of deceiving you. In 27 companies there has been one occurrence connected with nonregulation relationships. It may be that we do not know everything, and that some soldiers perhaps cover this up, but in any case we try to know everything that goes on in the Armed Forces.

[Gorbachev] Just a moment, do not read the question. Comrade Borovik, since the comrades have appeared.

[Borovik] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, I think that we all agree with you that we must bow down before those soldiers who helped, say, at the time of the earthquake in Armenia. It seems to me, however, that this is not quite the civil defense about which you speak, because civil defense is not regular regiments; it is something else. Civil defense—to be precise, the education of a population which must know how to act in critical situations—quite a lot of time and resources have been expended on this. It gave a pretty poor showing in Chernobyl and in Armenia. Has the time not come to create an accident rescue system all over the country; the creation of this has been spoken about, Nikolay Ivanovich spoke about it. I would like to know how matters stand in that sphere.

Secondly, and I have three questions. The second question is this. Recently the Americans came out with research, they published a book on the whole complex of the effect of radioactivity on our lives. This includes the test ranges—we had a discussion about Semipalatinsk at the congress, the production of nuclear warheads and radioactive material, the storage and burial of both our materials and those we import, the explosions themselves, and the dissemination via ground water. When we take all this as a complex, an extraordinarily difficult picture is obtained. Do we have any data which generalizes on this complex?

And the third question. You know that for many years, mankind has marked the tragedy of the Hiroshima explosion on 6 August every year. Well, before these demonstrations take place all over the world and before there are peace waves, a nuclear explosion has taken place in the Soviet Union on the 2d, 3d, or 4th of August for many years now; I cannot tell you exactly, perhaps 10 years. The Soviet Peace Committee has approached the Ministry of Defense about this on several occasions, because this provides an opportunity for anti-Soviet demonstrations, too, to begin all over the world. The year before last, there was such an explosion. I cannot remember whether there was one last year. I would very much request that you simply take this wish into account. Thank you.

I would like to say that not only the civil defense regiments—but on the night when the earthquake occurred—25,000 servicemen participated in rendering assistance to the stricken population. Among them there were servicemen themselves as well in the earthquake zone. The whole of the 7th....

[Gorbachev, interrupting] The question put by Comrade Borovik concerns civil defense. What is your opinion of it?

[Yazov] I think that in the first few days the civil defense forces worked selflessly, conscientiously, but as time went on, naturally...[pauses] so to speak....

[Gorbachev, interrupting] As a whole, what is your opinion of the civil defense forces?

[Yazov] As a whole, Mikhail Sergeyevich, my opinion of the defense forces—but these are those troops that we have deployed for some specific purposes. When something must be done within a few days, they work conscientiously, but when it drags on for 6 months or a year, every family's enthusiasm becomes blunted, everyone has a job to go to, and the whole thing splits apart. Here one must evidently change the personnel periodically. And perhaps, first and foremost from those regions where it occurred.

As far as the officers are concerned, the officers worked in the most conscientious manner and the largest number of people who were exposed to radiation at Chernobyl were officers and generals.

Regarding the second and third questions we shall undoubtedly take this matter into consideration, evidently it was not sufficiently tactful to carry out explosions sometime on the 6th or 7th. But, comrades, explosions have to be conducted. The Americans have carried out 1,071 explosions. They carried out the last explosion on 27 June. For a year and a half we have not conducted any explosions. We are lagging behind them. They have already managed to develop fairly successfully the EMI [as transliterated] weapon. But we haven't. So, what are we to do? Lag behind? I have some questions. Some forbid explosions on the Semipalatinsk testing ground, others on Novaya Zemlya, but where will they order them? We have got to develop weapons, otherwise we will lag behind the United States of America. You see, priority is not just a matter of who has the most tanks. Priority is upheld precisely by nuclear weapons. Mikhail Sergeyevich has said that nuclear weapons should be destroyed by the year 2000, but that applies to us and to them. And if we are the only ones destroying them, what kind of defense capability will there be? Mikhail Sergeyevich, there were several questions with regard to....

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Wait a minute, wait a minute. And the third question, regarding the possible radioactive effect on the population in connection with distribution, storage, and so forth. [indistinct remarks from the floor]

[Yazov] But I have said we apologize if that happened before that. In any event I never made a decision to explode nuclear ammunition on the 6th or 7th and to blow up our Committee for the Defense of Peace. [laughter]

[Gorbachev] All right, the next question on the possibility of a radioactive effect on the population.

[Yazov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, many organizations in our country are engaged in this. As far as the Defense Ministry is concerned, those of our facilities which carry our monitoring [kontrol] do not see such levels of radiation as are of danger to the population. Nowhere in the Soviet Union does the level of radiation exceed the background value except in those areas that have already been determined after the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES].

[Gorbachev] Go ahead, Comrade Shuskin.

[Shuskin] I have two questions for the defense minister. The first question: Tell me please, during the earthquake in Armenia were any military facilities damaged, did any kind of explosions occur at any military facilities with which the Armenian land is packed? That is the first question. And the second question. Be so kind as to resolve the issue of conscripts from the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic remaining on the territory of the disaster zone and working on the restoration of Armenia's national economy?

[Yazov] On the territory where the earthquake occurred, in the area of the town of Spitak, there was a munitions depot—1,500 wagon loads. There were no explosions. Every single piece of ammunition has been withdrawn from the territory. Approximately four wagonloads of ammunition in which the firing mechanisms [vzryvatel] were either damaged or shaken themselves, and it would have been dangerous to move, we exploded them in the area of Spitak. There were no other explosions. The depot which was located near Leninakan did not suffer. We have now moved this depot to beyond the bounds of the town of Leninakan to a safe site. Over that period there were no other explosions on the territory of Armenia.

The second question: Those students who were to have undergone practical training have, at the request of the chairman of the Council of Ministers, been allowed to remain on the territory of Armenia to join in the restoration work. As far as calling up those who are eligible for active military service, they are called up and will serve, just like everyone else, in different areas. [voices raised from floor; attempts to ask more questions]

[Gorbachev] Just a minute, have you understood my situation and the distortions of our accord? They are dictated by the fact that for more than 40 minutes there

were replies, but during that time there were masses of questions. I requested those comrades who were not satisfied with these answers. But now we have used up exactly an hour.

[Yazov] Here is one question that has been asked several times. On Zhukov. Allow me to answer it.

[Gorbachev] What is it?

[Yazov] On Zhukov. With respect to the memory of Zhukov.

[Gorbachev] Well, all right then.

[Yazov] Comrades, there have been several notes enquiring what is being done to immortalize the memory of Marshal of the Soviet Union Georgiy Konstantinovich Zhukov. By a decision of the Soviet Government, it has been decided to erect a monument to Zhukov in the city of Moscow. I think that Zhukov cannot be taken away, be separated from the Great Fatherland War. A memorial is being built, and there Zhukov will occupy the most honored, the most worthy place. We are collecting materials, relics, everything that is connected with Zhukov. A special place has been allocated at the Museum of the Soviet Armed Forces. As for setting up a separate museum, well, if such a decision is made, we shall work on it.

[Gorbachev] All right, let's decide how we shall go on further. We have spent an hour instead of the 45 minutes permitted. Shall we limit ourselves [uproar in hall] All right, all right. I can see that you are at the microphone, that you have the desire to ask questions. Therefore I want to make everything clear, so to speak. You can also see that comrades are at the microphones. Let us solve this question. Thus, the following proposal is being submitted. To limit questions to this, and then to go over to the discussion. Those in favor of this proposal, please raise your hands. All right, put your hands down. Who is against it? Well, we are agreed upon it, comrades. We have agreed upon it. Dmitriy Timofeyevich, thank you. An interval of 20 minutes is announced.

Gorbachev Speech Supports Yazov

LD0407162589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Report on speech by Mikhail Gorbachev at 3 July session of USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Text] [Begin recording] [Gorbachev] Comrades! The situation that has arisen as a result of the discussion of Comrade Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov's candidature for the post of USSR minister of defense is probably of a kind that requires me to take the floor after all, insofar as in this case I also sit before you as chairman of the USSR Defense Council. I have listened to everything that you have said. I will try to express my own point of view from positions of principle on the discussion of this question—insofar as it has acquired such sharpness.

First, I think we are going to have to think through in the Supreme Soviet how we are going to discuss the problems of the Army. There is not one parliament where everything is discussed that concerns defense and state security. For this purpose committees and commissions are set up, councils of national security, and so on; so that we are going to have to give great powers to committees on issues, over a wide range of issues, relating to this specific sphere, in order to be able to entrust thing to them. And if questions arise—and they have arisen here—on the formation of the committees or commissions in the present case—then we have to return to this question and look at it once again. Because we are not goig to be able—I will tell you straight, by virtue of the fact that now I know what this means—and I will try, using permissible statements, so to speak, and using permissible information, to say something to you about this. Since this is so, therefore, the situation that will probably arise will be one of certain omissions and reticence, particularly with regard to the substance itself, so to speak, of defense and security. But this does not invalidate much of what was said here. This is already under discussion in society and it will be discussed in society and it is right that an organism like our Army and our Armed Forces is being discussed, for this is of enormous importance, no matter from which viewpoint we approach it—though first and foremost from the viewpoint of ensuring our country's security and resolving those tasks which we have set ourselves and are now setting ourselves under the conditions of the restructuring and renewal of Soviet society.

And so, because we do not have this clarity about what our structure is like, it will evidently be necessary to hold a closed session at which the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, who heads the Defense Council under the Constitution, must present a new composition of the Defense Council. Clearly we will have to discuss this at a closed session so that the deputies can be given more information, although there will no doubt be certain limits here, too.

In view of the fact that so far not all of this has been clear to the Supreme Soviet, the way it looks is that all in all we are exaggerating the role of the USSR Defense Minister. Above all he is being reproached for not proposing strategy, and consequently he does not have a mastery of it, and that is dangerous. Deputy Medvedev particularly focused his attention on this.

I have to say that strategy in these issues is worked out by the USSR Defense Council and it bears the responsibility for this. Of course, the minister is on it and is a member of the Defense Council along with others. I will not list them now, but there is the chairman of the Council of Ministers there, there's the foreign minister, there are comrades in charge of the defense industry, there is the main command personnel of the Armed Forces, but not all of them—not all of them, but precisely the main personnel, only a handful. So now I am not going to touch upon this problem, but later, when we

reach this issue and have to approve the Defense Council, I think we will discuss it in greater detail and present all data, so to speak, so that we can understand what kind of body that is.

And so, the Defense Council. Comrade Yazov, like the others, as a member of the Defense Council...they can insist, they can argue on every issue, on every one. But in the final analysis the decision of all key issues, key issues—of course, how this or that unit should be run and so on, for this, on the basis of regulations, again, approved in the appropriate manner, the approporiate command personnel and the minister responsible—but as far as strategy is concerned, it is worked out by the Defense Council. [sentence as heard] And that is why the Defense Council altogether had to be decisively restructured. It functions nowadays. By the way, it used to work spasmodically and was merely formal. That led to the concentration of the whole problem literally in the hands of several men, so to speak, if not just one man's hands, and we are reaping the fruit of this, so to speak. We had to revive the Defense Council decisively and put it in the role, at the level, which it should be playing. And now it is gaining this. And first of all we had to look at what kind of doctrine we ought to be pursuing. That was what everything began with. A doctrine was formed, a military-political doctrine.

On the basis of this military-political doctrine a most profound restructuring of the Armed Forces is taking place. Not everything has been elucidated. And the arguments which arise here—and I feel that they also reach the officers; Comrade Podziruk here mentioned some of the things—have not been, in a sense, finally settled, as far as development work is concerned. But profound changes are taking place here. And indeed we have counted on the quality of the Army. There are enormous programs on that account, serious programs, in-depth; some have been worked out, others are being prepared in order to make our Armed Forces like that.

The situation that had formed in the Army itself was very serious. And, if you recall, one of the first decisions at the restructuring stage, at the very first stage, was the Central Committee decision on strengthening discipline. Because there, in the Army, there was a situation which was fraught with serious dangers—first and foremost the dangers that we could turn out to be without guarantees from the point of view of the country's security, although we are doing our best and were committing so much effort and wealth to get it guaranteed.

On the other hand, a lack of discipline in the Army, where the service of the officers and so on, (?the military cadres), is coupled with these kind of weapons, could also lead to unpredictable things. That is why there was the first step, and on the basis of that decision enormous work began there, enormous. It is, so to speak, on a large scale. And this process is still a long way from completion. Frankly, it is only just developing. And many people do not like that, many people don't like it. I am not going to enumerate everything now. Perhaps later on we will go on to supplement these aspects—improving the Armed Forces—in greater detail, so to speak, when we talk about the Defense Council.

But in connection with this I would like to get to the following: What role in all this restructuring, fundamental restructuring, which is even harder than in society, because this is a specific organism, was played by the present candidate for the post of USSR defense minister? I have to say that when the situation arose—you remember in what specific circumstances, and there came the question of having to strengthen the leadership of the USSR Defense Ministry—at that time Comrade Yazov worked as deputy minister for personnel. And having got down to personnel work, I have to say that Comrade Yazov showed himself to be a courageous and principled Communist. He did not succeed in everything by far, but he took a principled position, because favoritism was what, you see, literally affected many of the personnel echelons. There was neglect, reluctance to move on; there was violation of the process of natural officer growth, of Army rejuvenation, so that the regular personnel, so to speak, of the Army are always able to take things upon themselves in any situation. There was a hold-up in all these personnel processes. Then he submitted a very important proposal to the Central Committee. And on the basis of that, fairly serious things began in clearing the Defense Ministry, the General Staff, and institutions adjacent to the ministry, of those who had done what they could and who had to be sent for a deserved rest, so that the way could be difficult both with the generals' corps and with others. And it still needs—the process still needs—to be continued.

Finally, I will tell you straight, the building of the Armed Forces was such as allowed garrisons and posts to be maintained in the country without any need for them. In connection with this, we have painlessly dealt with and eliminated what used to stand for—used to imitate—so-called divisions. We have eliminated 101 divisions. Have you felt our Army get weaker? No. They were feeding troughs.

In short, all processes—from military-political, strategic and then going on to Armed Forces building, personnel issues, the solution of technical problems in order to give our Army new qualities, all this—has now started to be done in the Army. But this is a very complex, major, large-scale, in-depth process. I will be straight—Comrade Yazov occupies progressive positions, although—and I was listening along with you—I am not satisifed with his replies on a number of questions. Either he was being restrained by the need not to go too far in his replies, so to speak, and say things that must not be said at this sitting—but I don't think he found the best answers on a number of issues. I see that on some questions he began to get irritated, which is altogether impermissible for anyone in the Supreme Soviet. Here we must all put forward arguments in a calm and well-reasoned way, so to speak, and find the correct

solution to any question. If we are going to start fisticuffs here and see who has scored or won the most points, that won't work. So no one should become irritable.

Therefore, I can see also the potential of Comrade Yazov at this stage, too. The Defense Council, which relies on the chairman of the council—who is also a member of the Defense Council—has recommended Comrade Yazov. I would not interrupt his activity now, seeing all the pluses and the minuses of this man. He has not had the time—comrades, he has been minister of defense since 1987—and it is not that simple to fully master this business, so to speak, including military-political issues and the direct management of the troops. Putting demands like this on any of the ministers—in this case I am not even referring to Comrade Yazov—is too arrogant. Comrade Yazov should have done it just like that. He still has to master this post, and he does have the potential for doing so. The fact that he has a chief of the General Staff who is already a representative of another generation of ours, so to speak—he was born in 1939—and there are other young cadres who are generals and so on, well, all of this makes it possible for this process of forming today's new cadre personnel at the head of our Army to take place. We must work together and build things.

As far as a number of questions are concerned, I think that further work should be done on the students' question and that it should be completed; that is the feeling of the Supreme Soviet and of our people, I feel. I've already received so many packets—Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] alone has handed me several thousand, and I'm amazed at where he's got them from—and there are others. Today's mood is such that one must not immediately brush aside the idea of giving replies here. It's a difficulty—but who doesn't have difficulties? Solutions have to be found, and I think work has to be done.

As for the question of how fulfilling security tasks, and ensuring our main forces which guarantee our security and the combat-readiness of our Army, can be combined with the requests being made by the republics, well, this, too, requires attentiveness and must be worked through. I do not think that Comrade Yazov is absolutely right. Similarly, I do not think that the proposals that the representatives of the republics are putting forward are absolutely correct. That wouldn't be serious on either side. These are very important questions and simply to play games here, to score points in front of everyone, in front of the working people—the working people know, and if they see that this is weakening the Army, then they will never remove these issues; they will never remove these questions because we all have an interest—and Comrade Kiseleva spoke correctly here when she said the Army is the Army, you know, it must solve its own tasks. That is the main thing. If the Army must resolve its own issues and if other bodies have to resolve all the rest, then other issues, so to speak, must accordingly be resolved here, and correct solutions found for them.

In short—summing up my thoughts as someone who has become used to these matters—and I'll tell you straight that this takes a lot of strength [words indistinct]—but I would ask you to support this candidature, with due regard for the fact that the Supreme Soviet has made very many just demands of Comrade Yazov. What one has to do here is not simply give an explanation and with the explanation avoid the issue: These questions, Comrade Yazov, require a solution. I simply had to say that to you, comrades, I had to say that to you.

Are there any questions for me?

[Unidentified voices] No.

[Gorbachev] All right. Who, then, is in favor of Comrade Yazov being appointed USSR Minister of Defense? Dmitriy Timofeyevich. Please vote. Please count the votes.

Some comrades here are saying that the discussion connected with Comrade Yazov's candidature should not be shown on television because it deals with such specific issues. Let's complete the process now, and we'll think about how we should do it. I don't think we have gone beyond the bounds. That's what I'd say—what I know I can compare [as heard], so to speak. We haven't gone too far? We haven't gone too far.

[Unidentified speaker] We have not gone too far. [end recording]

[Announcer] The procedure of voting on the candidature of Comrade Yazov, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, for the post of USSR Defense Minister is now taking place in the hall. The votes are being counted.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] So, 256 in favor. Who votes against? Please count them. 77 against. Who abstains, comrades? [end recording]

[Announcer] The vote counting of those abstaining on Comrade Yazov's candidature continues.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] How many? Sixty-six. Well, add them up. How many deputies are there altogether? I usually get it wrong. Comrades, by the time the autumn session comes there will be a calculator of some kind —we'll think of something. Comrades, who hasn't taken any part in the voting at all? We had 434 registered; now it comes to 429. Have you counted the presidium or not? [indistinct remarks from the floor] Ah, well. [laughter] Well, I'm in favor of Yazov. Comrades, as a minimum we need 215.

[Unidentified speaker] Two hundred and sixteen.

[Gorbachev] So, 216 under our new method that we adopted at the Supreme Soviet 216, alright, 217, or even 220. Comrade Yazov got 256 votes, with 77 against and 66 abstentions. So he is appointed USSR defense minister. [applause] Comrades! It seems to

me...Comrade Yarin, here, and indeed all the others have touched upon it, Comrade Medvedev and Comrade Olekas, too, I think, and there was another who signed—or was it just the two of them—they wrote me a note, and these two notes enable me perhaps to say the following. I think that all of us have an interest that here in our society and especially in the Supreme Soviet we should precede from respect for the values upon which we are restructuring and living and thinking of renewing our society in the interests of all peoples, all nationalities, of each family and of each individual. I consider that in our society of many nationalities—and I tried to say this with absolute frankness on Saturday—we will not cope with any of the tasks, especially the tasks of restructuring and the preservation and development of the process of democratization and harmonization of relations between the peoples, if we do not deal thoroughly with issues of interethnic policy as applied to urgent requirements, as applied to the current situation. I think this is perfectly clear to all of us.

However, the first point in this is attitudes of respect, comrades, and that is where we must begin, both in society and of course in the work of the Supreme Soviet, the forum which represents the whole country. There should be an attitude of respect for each other no matter whom we represent and no matter which people we represent. There must be an exchange of opinions and a search for solutions to the many questions which have arisen. We have already set about them, and we will do so now—these are the main questions which will face all of us now over the next few months. In no other atmosphere will we find these solutions. If we are respectful of each other—and that is what we have to be—then any other approach means discord and strife, and that means calamity. There's no playing it down—it means calamity.

Comrades, I would share the concern expressed by the deputies over the fact that these flare-ups take place in the Supreme Soviet from time to time. Let us be understanding of the fact that this concern is being expressed in different ways—some people in one way, others in a different way—but overall in the Supreme Soviet we must preserve constructive discussion, respectful discussion, so that we can sort out all issues. Indeed if there are questions which really are of that kind, then it seems to me that in the Soviet of Nationalities and in the commissions and chambers it is possible, so to speak, to have a look and agree. Comrade Medvedev invites you to go and have a look. Well, go and have a look. No doubt the comrades want to say that they see the situation differently from the way it appears here in front of us. Well, in that case let's sort it out, but again there must be respectfulness, attention and so forth.

I would strongly urge all of us to be aware of this very great responsibility for peace in our common home, the USSR, especially since we are moving along the road of deep changes in order to impart a new quality to our federation based upon the Leninist principles and also within the context of the experience that we have—both positive and negative—and within the context of present realities and the present stage in the development of the USSR. I think, therefore, that there is no need for any discussion to be started, comrades. Do you agree? [cries of "yes"] I declare an interval until 1600. [end recording]

Mostovoy Discusses Wholesale Trade

LD0307172289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Report by commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The candidacy of Pavel Ivanovich Mostovoy was examined [at the supreme soviet session]. He has been proposed for the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gossnab]. Comrade Mostovoy made a speech to the deputies. He dwelt in detail on the system of wholesale trade that is being developed in our country and he said, inter alia:

[Begin Mostovoy recording] The introduction of wholesale trade began in 1987, and then it amounted to 4 percent. This year it comes to 40 percent, or R115 billion. It is intended that we shall go over completely to wholesale trade in 1992. Wholesale trade is not the exchange of cards for supply, but a system with a whole number of problems. The first stage: By the end of this 5-year plan, a reduction of centralized distribution of balanced types of output will occur. The second stage is the years of the 13th 5-Year Plan. They should become the period of the coming all-union socialist market in the means of production. In the past 2 years, the list of output distributed by Gossnab, and accordingly the registering of orders, have been reduced seven-fold. Priority is being given today to the transfer to the provision of supplies to the social sphere without funds. Wholesale trade in the agro-industrial complex will be expanded sharply.

From 1990, motor transport, machine tools, tractors, equipment, and mechanisms are being transferred to sale via territorial bodies on the basis of wholesale trade. Metal is being transferred in Belorussia, Moldavia, Kirghizia, Tajikistan, and Turkmenia, and in 25 krays and oblasts of the Russian Federation, and timber material in Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia and in a number of oblasts in the Russian soviet federated republics. As for the remaining regions, this will occur in 1991 and 1992 respectively. However, most output will be sold through intermediaries of Gossnab's territorial directorates. This will make it possible to conduct trade on a good technical basis, and concentrate resources on providing for the major needs of the national economy and the economically unprotected consumers.

A state automated information system with a bank of commerical information is being set up. The process for restructuring the USSR Gossnab will be continued, as

will its transfer to an economic basis and the demarcation of the functions of the state and economic management. Twenty-five financially autonomous trade intermediary associations will be created from the central apparatus. Their relations with the territorial directorates, ministries and departments, the republics, krays and oblasts will be contractual. [end recording]

[Ruvinskiy] Comrade Mostovoy also talked about the great resources that exist in the supply system. He considers one of the main tasks to be the more sensible use of secondary resources. There is experience of such work in a number of Union Republics and in the Ukraine in particular, and it should be spread more widely. Comrade Mostovoy answered numerous questions from the deputies. During the discussion of the candidacy, a number of critical remarks were also voiced alongside support for the program of the candidate for the post. In particular, deputies considered the system of wholesale trade in existence at present to be imperfect, since a large proportion of resources are still distributed under it on the basis of directives. As a result of the vote, Comrade Mostovoy was endorsed in the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of USSR State Commission for Material and Technical Supply.

4 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

Discussion of Silayev Candidacy

LD0407080889 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The USSR Supreme Soviet began its deliberations today with a discussion of Ivan Silayev, the last candidate for the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Anatoliy Lukyanov, first vice president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is chairing the session during the French visit by President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Soviet parliament has been discussing cabinet appointments since last Wednesday. It took a decision on Monday which will evidently have a positive effect on the further consideration of personnel questions. Decisions connected with appointments and procedural issues will now be adopted by a majority vote of the deputies present and not of the total number of the two chambers, as was the case before.

The former practices, established by the old Soviet parliament which convened for two or three days, have proved unacceptable for the permanently operating Supreme Soviet. Some deputies are members of republican parliaments, others combine activities in the Supreme Soviet with other duties. Therefore, they are unable to attend parliamentary sittings every day. The work of the last week showed that it was often impossible, due to this fact, to muster a majority vote of the total number of the two chambers. Some decisions, for instance the appointment of Vladimir Kamentsev as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers (foreign economic questions) were not taken precisely due to this. The adoption of decisions has now been simplified.

Silayev Confirmed Deputy Chairman

LD0407141389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Today's session of the USSR Supreme Soviet has resumed following a 20-minute break. Since 1000 the deputies have continued to discuss matters connected with the formation of the Soviet Government. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. At the beginning, from 1000, the candidacy of Ivan Stepanovich Silayev for the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Bureau of the Council of Ministers on machine building was discussed. The floor was given to Comrade Silayev. In a speech lasting nearly 30 minutes, he set out a detailed program for the work of the machine building complex, and, among other things he said, please listen to this:

[Begin Silayev recording] I would like to inform you that in 1987 the United States produced three times more machine-building output than was produced in the Soviet Union. We produced 7 times fewer cars than the United States, 5 times fewer trucks, 2 times fewer road-building machines, and as for the electronics industry, it is difficult to make comparisons here, but the figure here runs to at least tens of times—and there is also a serious lag in scientific and technical progress and in quality. Of course, the United States has its own problems, and we have ours, but nevertheless, this comparative picture enables us to draw conclusions about what we have to do in a short time—actually do what the United States accomplished in the fifties and sixties, in 15 years of dramatic development in this area.

We consider that we have our own program, and we have to have it, which would enable us to also reach advanced levels within quite a short time. It is natural that, using the old administrative and managerial methods, you won't achieve anything here, and we became convinced of this during our work in 1986 and 1987. Only beginning from 1988 did certain positive signs appear in the work of a number of areas in connection with the transition to self-financing. Hence we consider that our main task, and that of the whole complex, including the Bureau, lies in creating conditions for highly effective work by the main productive sector under conditions of the new radical reform.

In our industry, as in others, the first, second, and other models are currently functioning. We are quite vigorously promoting work which is proceeding under conditions of financial autonomy. We have such enterprises as

the Sumy association with just over 20,000 staff, and the Kursk bearing works, and so on—in all about 330. But at the same time they also have serious shortcomings—they have been spoken about. The experience of the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, which they will soon be accumulating in transferring income and taxation to the principles of financial autonomy from 1 July, is of interest to us. About 20 enterprises have expressed a desire to do the same, and from the results of this year the effectiveness will be clear, and we are counting on this. And then, evidently, many of our enterprises will find it possible to use this plan. We thus consider that, in economic terms alone, we are capable, and we should step things up considerably in order to use the potential which we currently have at our disposal.

Comrades, we understand that matters of monopolization are a serious obstacle, and in paricular in the work of the machine builders. Here, too, I cannot fail to provide examples. In the United States 90 percent of enterprises are manned by 100-500 people. In the Soviet Union 60 percent of enterprises are manned by 1,000 and more. We already feel that we have to start dividing, bringing out, especially specialized enterprises which are part of many production associations, and give them possibilities and full status under the Law on the Enterprise, and thereby give them the possibility of highly specializing their production and working for many consumers.

I would like to inform you of my attitude to the State Acceptance Service. Of course, in the initial stage the State Acceptance Service played a certain role in tightening up on discipline, a positive role. But in the creative process of creating qualitative output, it clearly is not addressing these tasks and in many cases is an obstacle. The State Acceptance Service has no interest in actively moving technical progress, and so it is already clear today that serious and radical measures are needed. [end recording]

[Announcer] In particular, Comrade Silayev went on to stress that if enterprises of the machine-building sector guarantee the quality of their output and (?ask for) the removal of the State Acceptance Service, then we will willingly go along with this. We will introduce the State Acceptance Service only in extreme situations where enterprises regularly produce shoddy goods. Moreover, we will introduce this service at the request of consumers, and for 6 months, no more. The USSR Supreme Soviet confirmed the candidacy of Comrade Silayev in the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Machine Building by a majority of votes. [passage omitted]

Kamentsev Fails To Win Approval

LD0407083189 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Vladimir Kamentsev, 61, who was proposed for the post of deputy premier and head of the State Foreign Economic Commission, failed to win parliamentary approval during a second vote at the USSR Supreme Soviet on Tuesday.

Kamentsev oversaw foreign trade in the outgoing government.

Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov said that his opinion of Kamentsev remains unchanged but that he will name a new candidate if parliament insists on it.

Discussion of Kamentsev Reported

LD0407104489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Correspondent Marina Novitskaya report from USSR Supreme Soviet meeting in Kremlin]

[Text] As you know the formation of the government is continuing at the session, or, to be more exact, the Presidium of the country's Council of Ministers has basically been formed at the morning session. It is made up of all the deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers in charge of affairs and the Minister of Finances. A difficult situation has arisen in connection with the vote on the candidature of Comrade Kamentsev. I remind you that it was proposed to confirm him in the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and as chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission. The discussion was held on 30 June and in the vote the number of votes for Kamentsev's candidature came to 246. That was the majority of those present at the session at that time, but a minority of the Supreme Soviet membership. So it became clear once again how wrong the deputies are who do not want to discuss matters relating to regulations and procedures, considering them to be not very important. But it turns out that they are extremely significant.

Yesterday the Supreme Soviet made an amendment to its regulations, and it was decided that a candidacy for a senior post will be deemed to be confirmed if the majority of those present at the session—I stress, the majority of those present at the session—vote for him. Today, working on the basis of this rule, they returned to the discussion of Comrade Kamentsev's candidacy.

Deputy Dzasokhov reported on the results of the discussion of this candidacy at the commissions that heard Vladimir Mikhaylovich. He said that it was the view of the commissions that endorsement of this candidacy should be recommended. Moreover, the remarks made during the hearing aroused an immediate, businesslike, and energetic reaction from Comrade Kamentsev.

But other colleagues of Deputy Dzasokhov, particularly Sobchak and Zhuravlev, objected strongly to this. They cited arguments against. The voting turned out to be truly dramatic. Only 200 votes were cast in favor of

Kamentsev's candidacy, and thus it was rejected. I should say that Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, openly disappointed by this decision, accepted it nonetheless in accordance with the law, but nonetheless he expressed his bewilderment at the unchecked, in his view, allegations by Deputy Sobchak, and he asked him for an explanation. This explanation will evidently be given, but for the time being I shall tell you about the evening session that began after the break.

The Supreme Soviet has begun discussing the candidacies of ministers. Here, too, procedural matters relating to this discussion were looked at initially. This time the deputies thought that this was very important. Therefore, it has been decided that 30 minutes will be allocated to the hearing of every minister, half of that time for the discussion of the program, and the rest of the time for questions and discussion. The first candidacy to be discussed was that of Apollon Sergeyevich Systsov, and he was presented and confirmed in the post of USSR Minister of the Aviation Industry. At present, the candidacy of Nikolay Andreyevich Pugin is being discussed. He has been presented for endorsement in the post of USSR Minister of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building. The discussion is continuing, and here I end my reportage from the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Ryzhkov Challenges Nepotism Charge

LD0407134189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Excerpts] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Radio diary. Commentator Olga Vasilenko is in the studio.

[Vasilenko] In the first half of the day the deputies continued the formation of the Council of Ministers. [passage omitted]

After the speeches there were answers to questions. As always, there were a lot of questions, and it was decided to give answers on individual problems to the author of each note outside the session period. Everything was fairly smooth, but one of the first to speak in the debate was Deputy Sazonov from Naberezhny Chelnyy, a young party secretary from a workshop at the Kama Motor Works. Let us hear what he said:

[Begin recording] [Sazonov] I personally am against Comrade Silayev's candidacy and against his standpoint, just as I was against the candidacies of Comrade Maslyukov and some other comrades. Why? In a discussion at the Commission on Economic Reform, Comrade Silayev said one thing when he was asked whether a minister, on being confirmed, can receive a recommendation from enterprises and labor collectives. He said that ministers, as members of parliament, must be independent; that is, ministers must be monopolists and labor collectives must work for them. So the people exist for the apparatus, not the apparatus for the people. Furthermore: Comrade Abalkin, I do not know how you will fulfill your second key problem—the struggle against monopolizing actions—if those who sit beside you support this monopoly. And I do not know, Comrade Abalkin, how you will balance the budget if Comrade Maslyukov has adopted a policy of overindustrializing the national economy, because in 4 years I have not known any government decision about balancing A- and B-group enterprises which constitutes earnings without regard for socially necessary labor expenditure. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Vasilenko] At the insistence of one deputy it was proposed today to continue the discussion of Kamentsev's candidacy. This took quite a dramatic turn. Two deputies, who are not members of the Supreme Soviet, spoke: Sobchak, who called on Kamentsev to purge the foreign economic relations apparatus of the Council of Ministers of relatives of high-ranking leaders; while the other deputy, Zhuravlev, expressed bewilderment at Kamentsev, as a former first deputy minister of the Fishing Industry [ministry], not knowing anything about the 'Okean' firm affair, which caused a great stir, and standing aside from it. [passage omitted]

All would seem to be democratic. But you know, I still felt that the deputies were dissatisfied about something. Something was wrong. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov stood up and asked to speak.

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] As a deputy—I am the only one in the government who is a people's deputy—using my rights, I want to ask the Supreme Soviet and the presidium about the following: Comrade Sobchak has hurled an accusation at Comrade Kamentsev, a former deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, according to which he, and I want to remind you that Comrade Kamentsev was in immediate charge of the apparatus of state commissions—I cannot remember how many people he had, 80 or 100—had relatives of high-ranking individuals in his apparatus, and so on. I request that a list be submitted. Be so kind as to present a list. I am demanding this officially. [end recording]

[Vasilenko] [Passage omitted] Nikolay Andreyevich Pugin was appointed minister of automotive and agricultural industry, and Vitaliy Fedorovich Konovalov was appointed USSR minister of atomic power engineering and industry today. With this the morning session ended. The session will continue its work in less than an hour.

11 Deputy Chairmen Approved

LD0407121189 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent

Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, now has nearly all his deputies approved. The USSR Supreme Soviet completed the approval of candidates today.

The morning sitting began with the discussion on the repeated appointment of Ivan Silayev, 59, to the post of deputy premier, who was again recommended head of the Bureau of the Council of Ministers on Machine-building. Setting out his action programme, the candidate called attention to the fact that Soviet industry now channels two-thirds of modern equipment to projects under construction and only one-third for retooling. Silayev said that he would seek to reverse the trend.

Frankly pinpointing weak spots of Soviet machine-building, the candidate noted that the economic reform and independence as well as conversion to peaceful production of munitions factories, whose equipment is at a higher technical level, would help do away with these weak spots. He said that the Soviet machine-building complex has many large hard-to-manage enterprises and favoured dismemberment of unflexible machine-building giants into several independent and smaller plants.

The Supreme Soviet approved Silayev deputy head of the cabinet by a majority vote.

Earlier, the Soviet Parliament approved as first deputy premiers Lev Voronin (general questions) and Yuriy Maslyukov (State Planning Committee), and as deputy premiers Leonid Abalkin (economic reform), Igor Belousov (military-industrial complex), Aleksandra Biryukova (social questions), Vladimir Gusev (chemical and forestry complex), Vitaliy Doguzhiyev (extraordinary situations), Nikolay Laverov (science and technology), Pavel Mostovoy (material and technical supplies) and Lev Ryabev (fuel and energy complex).

Vladimir Kamentsev who headed the State Foreign Economic commission as deputhy premier in the former cabinet, was again recommended for this job but failed to win the deputies' support. Many deputies spoke of insufficient competence of the candidate both during the first discussion last Friday and during repeated consideration today. They noted that he lacked a coherent programme for the development of foreign economic ties.

Thus, Parliament approved two first deputies and nine deputies of the head of the government. There is one vacant post of first deputy who will head the agricultural complex: Ryzhkov has not found a candidate for the post. He has to find also a new deputy premier in charge of foreign economic operations.

The Supreme Soviet now starts examining a big list of candidates for the posts of heads of ministries and state committees. Only three ministers have been approved so far: Eduard Shevardnadze (foreign affairs), Dmitriy Yazov (defence) and Valentin Pavlov (finance).

Systsov, Pugin, Konovalov Confirmed

LD0407135589 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR has completed the appointment of deputy prime-ministers and proceeded to confirm appointees to the posts of ministers and heads of state committees. Only three ministers have so far been confirmed—those of foreign affairs, defence and finance.

The first to be considered was the candidature of Apollon Systsov, 60, for minister of the aircraft industry of the USSR. In his address he stressed that the conversion of the defence sector of the economy involves putting out new civil aircraft and doubling the production of models currently in use. The ministry plans to treble the output of equipment for the light industry, agrarian sector and distribution network, the candidate said. Production of consumer goods must rise from 2.7 billion roubles this year to 4 billion roubles in 1990.

The parliament confirmed Systsov for minister of the aircraft industry by an overwhelming majority.

Debates were much more heated when it came to appointing Nikolay Pugin, 49, minister of automobile and agricultural machine building of the USSR. The reason is easy to understand: So far the industry has been providing equipment, especially for agriculture, that leaves much to be desired. In a self-critical speech the candidate analyzed the state of affairs in the production of agricultural machinery and presented a concrete programme of action for the near future. He pointed to the need to liquidate the monopoly of major plants and to expand and update production. He said that in 1990 the industry will produce 50,000 small tractors for leaseholders. Pugin told parliamentarians that a decision has been taken to double the production, in the 13th five-year plan period, of cars, above all with the help of expanded capacities of already existing works. This will help alleviate the situation on the market.

Parliamentarians found the programme well thought-out and voted the candidate into the post by a majority.

Fundamental scientific research, engineering designs and production of high technologies—such is the scope of activity of the Ministry of the Nuclear Power Industry of the USSR. Today, the parliament confirmed Vitaliy Konovalov, 57, as head of this ministry. Speaking at the session he stressed that he views the creation of new type reactors and the ensuring the safety of nuclear power stations as the tasks of prime importance in his work.

The parliament will resume discussions in the afternoon.

Large Majority Confirms Katushev

LD0407141189 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] The incumbent minister for foreign economic relations, Konstantin Katushev, was today reappointed to this post by the national parliament.

The 62-year-old minister facilitated the development of economic ties between the USSR and member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (in which he represented the Soviet Union) and other nations while heading the State Committee for Foreign Economic relations since 1985. In 1988, he was placed at the head of a new ministry to deal with foreign economic relations that was formed upon the merger of the Foreign Trade Ministry and the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations.

The impressive majority (only 37 deputies out of more than 400 present voted against, and 32 abstained) with which Katushev was confirmed is in striking contrast with the vote on the candidacy of his superior Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission, who was again recommended to this post but failed to secure support in parliament.

Nuclear Power Issue Discussed

LD0407223289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Relay of the proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 4 July—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Lukyanov] The USSR Council of Ministers has put forward the proposal to appoint Comrade Vitaliy Fedorovich Konovalov as minister of atomic power engineering and industry of the USSR.

[Konovalov] [passage omitted] Of the main special tasks facing the ministry I shall dwell on the major tasks. These comprise, in the first instance, comrades, designing and creating defense equipment. Although defense equipment today occupies only 28 percent of the ministry's output, and 72 percent of the output comprises civilian output, nonetheless, this defense theme remains the main and leading theme. Attention to it should not be relaxed, and in the first instance we must ensure reliable modern equipment which does not break down. The second major direction is connected with designing and planning steam producing installations of various types. This refers primarily to atomic power stations. [AES's] [passage omitted]

The third major subsector is the one engaged in producing construction materials for the first two tasks. This is a very large subsector. In the first instance this concerns enterprises producing various metals, ceramics and a number of other substances, including gold, of which we produce up to 15 percent, and fertilizer. [passage omitted]

With regard to the financing of the sector as a whole: We wish to direct about 37 percent to social issues, including rural areas; 39 percent to industry, and 24 percent to fundamental applied science and its development. [passage omitted]

The next question is what do I think about conversion [of defense industries to civilian use] as we have many hydrometallurgical and metallurgical enterprises? Well, comrades, I think that we must in the first instance use the existing potential. I shall not say alot about this, I'll just give some examples, such as our Navoi mining and enrichment combine which, as well as processing uranium raw material, also processes and produces gold. There we are reducing the extraction of uranium ores and the processing of them. We wish to use the capacity thus freed directly to increase and bring in even more ore material directly for the production and extraction of extra gold—that will amount to several tonnes of gold.

[passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] Thank you. We move on to the discussion of the candidacy. Comrade Velikhov has the floor. Deputy Velikhov, please.

[Velikhov] [passage omitted] With regard to science this is a unique ministry because fundamental research on a modern scale—accelerators, thermonuclear synthesis, and a whole range of other areas including superconductivity—is only accessible to this ministry. I have worked in the academy for 15 years and I know that the academy cannot go in for it; it does not have the necessary infrastructure. [passage omitted]

There are some fears that medium medium machine-building is perhaps an organization which is too closed. This is not a matter of people and not a matter of medium machine-building. It was closed for specific reasons. Yesterday you heard the decision of the minister who is handing over his functions that from now all work on atomic power engineering from the mine to burying will be completely open and accessible to all, to complete monitoring [kontrol].

[Lukyanov] The floor is given to Viktor Dmitriyevich Romanenko, Committee on Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Wealth.

[Romanenko] Esteemed comrades, in connection with the fact that the Ministry of Atomic Power will now also run AES's, the Committee on Ecology invited Vitaliy Fedorovich, the candidate for the post of minister, and a detailed conversation took place between us. I want to say straight away that Vitaliy Fedorovich made a very good impression and we all unanimously [yedinoglasno] supported his candidature. However, I would also like to express here a number of requests to the new ministry.

First, the selection of sites for AES's. Today this is a very, very serious question, and one of principle. In the Ukraine alone, in literally the last 5 years, four sites have been subjected to very serious doubt by scientists and well-founded doubt, and a number of these sites have been charged. I would like to say in this connection that the site for the Chigirin AES—and it was proposed to build the Chigirin AES on the Kremenchug reservoir—

was unacceptable ecologically and economically. Why? Because the Kremenchug reservoir is a water-distributing reservoir and 30 million people and industry are fed with water from it. I would also like to say that the second site, the thermal AES in the region of the town of Odessa, is directly on a geological fault. Thanks to the efforts of scientists from the Academy of Sciences, this site has been dropped. Arguments are underway at the moment with regard to the Crimean AES. The Crimean AES, apart from the fact that the question of what kind of seismicity there is there, is now being placed in doubt; you see, in the geographic sense, such facilities should not be built there because today the danger of progress remains, and the danger of any kind of accident cannot be excluded.

I would like to say that when the Chernobyl accident took place a system was worked out at the Institute of Cybernetics in the Ukraine's Academy of Sciences, a system for appraising the selection of sites, and when they studied all of the parameters of those sites which were selected, the Chernobyl AES site turned out to be the worst. Therefore, I appeal to the new minister of atomic power to use all that scientific potential which we have today, and not simply emotionally, or in study rooms, proceeding from the interests of departments, to decide on this or that site, but to apply modern methods which, I repeat, exist today.

Second: Yesterday, by the assertion of Lev Dmitriyevich Ryabov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, an idea was expressed that the density of distribution of AES's in certain regions of our country, including in the Ukraine, is less than in France and in other capitalist countries. I have heard this term on more than one occasion from representatives of atomic planning organizations. I would like to say that there here is not only a profound error but also a lack of understanding of the difference between the situation which has taken shape today in the Ukraine and in Belorussia and that in the countries which are cited today. I would like to say to Comrade Ryabov and the minister who is being newly appointed that we in the Ukraine today have an open radioecological system. Standing before us today is the question of moving people out of Belorussia, from the Ukraine, and from a number of populated points.

Today we have maps which clearly show where there are high levels of radioactivity on our territory. That is the reality today, and therefore we need to talk not about those reactors which are hermetically closed, but we need to talk about that open radioecological system with which we have dealings today in the republic, in the Ukraine and in Belorussia. Therefore there cannot be any talk today about any kind of additional siting today of atomic reactors in the southwestern region of our republic. I'm not saying anything now about the fact that there is no water there.

The last thing which I would like to say: Once more I want to return to Chernobyl—this is our pain, the pain of both the Russian and the Ukrainian and the Belorussian peoples. Today we are endorsing a minister here who is a specialist in the area of atomic reactors. I would like to draw attention to the fact that the RBMK [as heard] reactor is not the reactor which makes it possible, with all the perfections, to make it safe. If I add to this that the watch method of servicing the Chernobyl AES is another vulnerable point, then it would seem therefore to me that the question of the closure of the Chernobyl AES must be considered in the near future. I think that in the government of our republic there is a proposal about how one can compensate for those losses of electricity which may arise in connection with the closure of the Chernobyl AES. Thank you for your attention. [applause] [passage omitted]

[Bogdanov] Bogdanov, Committee for Youth Affairs, Gorkiy. [passage omitted]

All the AES's which were built 10-12 years ago were built in the most barbarous way. I have evidence here from witnesses and I shall hand them to the Presidium about the way the building was carried out—with old concrete, with cracks and holes, with reinforcements that had lain around on the territory of the AES's for 2-3 years. What can one say about the quality of construction of the AES's if a year ago it was impossible to approach our Gorkiy atomic heat and power station unless one was wearing high boots and it was due to go into operation in 1984. We greatly distrust those AES's whose construction began a long time ago. [passage omitted]

Council of Ministers Appointments

LD0407180189 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament ended today the discussion of candidates to the posts of deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers. Two first deputy chairmen and nine deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers were appointed. These are Lev Voronin (general questions), and Yuriy Maslyukov (State Planning Committee) who were appointed first deputy prime ministers, as well as Leonid Abalkin (the economic reform), Igor Belousov (military industrial complex), Aleksandra Biryukova (social problems), Vladimir Gusev (the chemical and timer complex), Vitaly Doguzhiev (emergency situations), Nikolay Laverov (science and technology), Pavel Mostovoi (material and technical supply), Lev Ryabev (fuel and energy complex) and Ivan Silaev (machine-building complex) who were appointed deputy prime ministers.

The post of first deputy prime minister in charge of the food complex remains vacant. Nikolay Ryzhkov has not yet chosen a candidate to this post. Another candidate will have to be found for the post of deputy prime

minister in charge of foreign economic relations, because Vladimir Kamentsev proposed by the head of government to this post was not supported by members of the Supreme Soviet.

Then the session began the discussion of a long list of candidates to the posts of ministers and heads of state committees. Only three ministers were endorsed by today—Eduard Shevardnadze (foreign minister), Dmitriy Yazov (defence minister) and Valentin Pavlov (finance minister).

The list became longer today. Apollon Systsov, 60, was reappointed minister of the aircraft industry. He has held this post since 1985. Aleksandr Volkov, 60, was reappointed minister of civil aviation. He has headed this industry since 1987.

Nikolay Pugin, 49, minister of automobile-making and farm machinery (?building), Konstantin Katushev, 62, minister of foreign economic relations, and Valeriy Bykov, 51, minister of the medical industry, were also reappointed on their posts.

Vitaliy Konavalov, 57, former deputy minister of medium machine-building, became a government member for the first time. He was appointed minister of nuclear power engineering and industry. Grigory Gabrielyants, 55, director of the All-Union Research Institute of Geological Prospecting, became minister of geology.

The discussion of the new government will be continued on Wednesday morning.

Supreme Soviet Approves Ministers

LD0407180589 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent reporting from the Kremlin:

The USSR Supreme Soviet continued in the afternoon today debates on candidacies to the posts of ministers and heads of state committees proposed by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

There was a great deal of faultfinding as the deputies heard a report from Konstantin Katushev, the 62-year-old candidate to the post of minister for foreign economic relations.

Saying that the situation in the USSR's foreign trade was far from ideal, Katushev, who had held this position before, did not agree with the view that guidance over this complex was a chain of improvisations.

Entry of manufacturers to the world market constituted the general line of the reform in the field of Soviet foreign trade, the candidate said.

Katushev came out in favor of the further expansion of the independence of the republics and regions of the country in conducting foreign trade transactions. At the same time he stressed the need for having a flexible system of state control over foreign economic activity.

The deputies positively assessed Katushev's programme and confirmed him in the post.

Providing the nation's economy with minerals is the principal task to be handled by the future minister of geology. The candidate, Grigoriy Gabrielyants, 55, has been in charge of the ministry's research institute for the past two years.

In his remarks, he stressed the need for a more thorough study of the requirements of the republics, regions and territories in determining the strategy of prospecting for mineral wealth.

He came out in favor of reducing the cost and enhancing the quality of geological prospecting on the basis of the broad use of results of scientific research.

Gabrielyants's substantive and well-argumented statement largely determined the decision: The parliament appointed him minister of geology by the majority of votes.

Aleksander Volkov, 60, has been reappointed minister of civil aviation, the position he has held since 1987. A professional pilot, he knows well problems that beset air transportation in the country. The chief problem today is that far from all potential travellers can buy tickets for the flight they want. Last year, a record number of passengers, 125 million, were transported but according to rough estimates, 15 million people failed to get on a flight for various reasons: a shortage of modern planes & fuel and deficiencies in ground technical facilities.

In order to increase passenger transportation, a package of measures is to be carried out. Among them is the earliest introduction of new-generation planes.

The minister announced plans to set up a competing firm to break the monopoly of the USSR's only airline Aeroflot.

Several members of parliament supported the candidate, among them civil aviation workers who said that Volkov's appointment had a positive effect on the state of affairs in civil aviation.

Moscow Deputy Boris Yeltsin did not agree with this viewpoint. He said that the industry did nothing to improve working conditions and improve repair facilities.

Attention to the development of local aviation services in remote areas was not sufficient. Transport aircraft are not fully used, sometimes [words indistinct] load is

estimated at only [number indistinct] per cent. Yeltsin suggested that the minister take these recommendations into account but said he would vote for him.

Valeriy Bykov, 51, who had headed the Ministry of Medical Industry, was left in his post.

Ryzhkov Accused of Slackness

AU0407200089 Paris AFP in English 1937 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, July 4 (AFP)—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov came under fire for the first time Tuesday for tolerating sloppy work from his subordinates, an AFP correspondent reported.

At a sitting to approve the appointment of new ministers, most of whom were reelected to the same posts, a Leningrad jurist, deputy Anatoliy Sobchak [spelling as received], accused Mr. Ryzhkov of being slack towards his underlings.

The accusation came after Mr. Ryzhkov demanded an explanation of charges of nepotism that Mr. Sobchak had previously made against the rejected candidate for deputy prime minister for foreign economic relations, Vladimir Kamentsev.

Politburo member Anatoliy Lukyanov, Mr. Gorbachev's understudy as president of the Supreme Soviet, failed in his attempt to call a vote of condemnation against Mr. Sobchak for his interruption.

Konstantin Katushev, who used to work under Mr. Kamentsev, was reappointed Minister for Foreign Economic Relations, while Grigoriy Gabrielyants, former director of the Institute of Petroleum Research was appointed Minister for Geology.

Deputy Asks Yeltsin To Explain

LD0507102489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2330 GMT 04 Jul 89

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet there was a serious discussion about the nature and tone of the debates and about the need to comply with the ethics of parliamentary interaction and about the inadmissability of unsubstantiated criticism. Deputy Manayenkov demanded that Deputy Yeltsin cite specific examples confirming the statement which this deputy made to the effect that certain leaders of republics, krays, and oblasts have their own personal planes and helicopters. [passage omitted]

5 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

More Ministerial Appointments

LD0507134789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 GMT on 5 July broadcasts a 5-minute report by correspondent Andrey Nikiforov on the 5 July proceedings of the joint session of the both houses of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Andrey Nikiforov opens by saying that Yuriy Mikhailovic Volmer has been appointed minister of the maritime fleet.

"In his speech he spoke in detail about the tasks facing the ministry; these are the fundamental renewal of the fleet, since at present almost one-quarter of all sea-going vessels have been in service more than 20 years and this is the period after which they must be written off. This issue is closely linked with the safety of maritime transportation. In this respect the minister supported the idea of formulating a national program for the safety of transportation, including maritime transportation. Yuriy Mikhailovich went on to say that the industry is ready for a transfer to currency self-financing and that by cooperating with foreign partners, it will be able to give the country a profit of R250 to R300 million annually. The minister spoke in favor of developing front-ranking technologies such as container, package, and lighter transportation. He recognized the necessity of devoting greater attention to social issues, of which housing is the main one. He dwelled on problems of ecology."

"Voting for candidacy of Comrade Volmer was as follows: against—two; abstentions—five."

"Boris Mikhailovich Belousov was appointed to the post of USSR minister of the defense industry. Speaking before the deputies he said that the main issues in the ministry's activity will be to provide the Armed Forces with the latest combat equipment, according to the principle of necessary sufficiency, and to implement the conversion programs to meet the needs of civilian production facilities. The minister said that the economic basis is the creation of a savings bank for the industry, the second model of financial autonomy and leasing. Comrade Belousov answered deputies' questions. There was no discussion of his candidacy and the results of the voting were: Against—none; abstentions—two."

"Oleg Nikolayevich Shishkin was appointed to the post of minister of general machine-building. In his speech he said that the role of this industry is very crucial precisely on issues of conversion since 65 percent of the total volume of work here consists of scientific research and design developments. Intellectual potential and technical developments are at present badly needed by the national economy but, of course, not to the detriment of defense. Oleg Nikolayevich also said that it will be possible to achieve the solution of many problems of the

national economy with the help of space programs, in particular communications problems. By launching powerful satellites into space it will be possible to increase the number of telephone subscriptions, expand central television programs, and also to work out very effective systems for locating and rescuing people in dangerous situations as well as to resolve many medical issues such as the provision of prosthetic appliances and wheelchairs. He said in particular that in the very near future a production line will come into service in our country for 50,000 of the most up-to-date wheelchairs annually.

"Discussion of the candidacy of Comrade Konarev for the post of minister of railways is now in progress at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet," Nikiforov concludes.

Supreme Soviet Elects New Ministers

LD0507114389 Moscow TASS in English 1024 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—By a TASS parliamentary correspondent: It is for the second week that the new Soviet parliament has been discussing the composition of the new government. A long list of candidates still remains to be scrutinised: There are some 40 names in it.

The Supreme Soviet began its workday on Wednesday with the discussion of the candidacy of Serafim Kolpakov, 56, a former ferrous metallurgy minister. Now that the ministries of the ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy have been merged, he was recommended to head the USSR Metallurgy Ministry. Deputies spoke not so much about candidates' qualities (all agreed that he is a specialist of top qualification) as about metallurgists' continued practice to pollute the environment. The candidate said what has been done to rectify the situation. Nevertheless, some of the members of parliament categorically demanded that his candidacy be turned down.

For instance, a telegram was read out by participants of an ecological rally in the Urals who threatened to recall deputies who voted for Kolpakov. But impartiality and common sense took the upper hand: Thirteen out of a total of 436 voted against the candidate and 17 abstained.

Boris Belousov, 55, who earlier headed the Machine-Building Ministry, was unanimously endorsed for the post of minister of the defence industry.

Only two people cast their votes against and five abstained during the endorsement of the 56-year-old Yury Volmer to head the Merchant Marine Ministry. He also held this post in the former cabinet.

Oleg Shishkin, 55, former first deputy minister of general machine-building, was a successful nominee. He will from now on head this ministry.

Konarev Rejected as Railways Minister

LD0507114689 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent: The USSR Supreme Soviet voted down a candidate for a post who was okayed by parliamentary committees and commissions. He is the second candidate who was turned down in the past two days. Deputies turned down today 62-year-old Nikolay Konarev who was again recommended for the post of the minister of railways. The vote was 130 for, 204 against and 40 abstained.

Deputies expressed many sharp critical remarks concerning the state of railways, traffic safety and quality of passenger service during the discussion of the candidate who headed the country's railway transport since 1982.

The USSR Supreme Soviet voted down on Tuesday [4 July] Vladimir Kamentsev who was recommended for the post of deputy premier and head of the State Foreign Economic Commission.

Candidacy Session Continues

LD0507131289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Right now a joint sitting of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet is resuming in the Kremlin. The deputies taking part in the work of the session are going to continue their examination of the issue of the personnel composition of our country's government.

Today the morning and the daytime sittings took place under the chairmanship of Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. The first candidacy to be presented for the deputies' examination was that of Serafim Vasilyevich Kolpakov who was being proposed for the post of the USSR minister of metallurgy. [passage omitted]

The debate on his candidacy was sharp, with deputies Penyagin, Kasyanov, Medikov, Grib, Nozdrya, Yarin, Chelyshev, and Romazanov taking part. [passage omitted]

The deputies examined the candidacy of Nikolay Semenovich Konarev for the office of the USSR minister of railways. [passage omitted] Taking part in appraising the proposed candidate's business and organizational qualities, and the situation in the sector were Deputies Kolesnikov, Kharif, Matveychuk, Boykov, Orekhov, Sapegin, Matyukhin, Khadzhiyev, Genchev, and others. [passage omitted]

Next, a recess was announced in the work of the session, during which USSR people's deputies paid their last respects to Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko. Before the recess Comrade Lukyanov, who chaired the sitting, reported that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium had received telegrams from working people who considered

that burying Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, a major statesman, in the Novodevichye cemetery was inadmissible. In connection with this it was explained that the decision to bury Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko at the Novodevichye cemetery was made at the request of the deceased's widow and whole family. [passage omitted]

Shimko, Kotlyar Confirmed Ministers

LD0507142989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session. Commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy reports from the all-union radio point in the Kremlin:

[Ruvinskiy] After a break during which people's deputies attended the lying-in-state of Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, the session was resumed.

The candidature of Vladimir Ivanovich Shimko to the position of minister of the radio industry of the USSR was discussed. The nominee to this position reported on the work program of the industry, noting that developments being made here should serve both the defense and the civilian sphere. The output of consumer goods was given great attention by Comrade Shimko. He noted that already next year output of these goods should grow by 27 percent, with these being primarily new unconventional types of goods such as domestic computer equipment, electronic toys, video equipment, and others. He also paid attention to the industry's social program.

Well, questions were asked about the prospects for increasing production of television sets and about prices of goods in the industry. All deputies who spoke generally approved his candidature. This opinion was also confirmed by the voting. Comrade Shimko was confirmed as minister of the radio industry of the USSR.

Next, the candidature of Comrade Kotlyar to the position of minister of fisheries was examined. I was present back at the time when Comrade Kotlyar's candidature was being examined in the committee on agrarian issues, on ecology, and at that time the debate was very exacting. But evidently he did not fully satisfy deputies. Then the committees recommended Comrade Kotlyar but now there were quite a few questions, too, and they were mainly about a careful attitude to natural resources, about fishermen's everyday life, and about supplies of equipment for them.

The voting has just taken place and Comrade Kotlyar has been confirmed as minister of fisheries.

Now Vladimir Grigoryevich Chirskov has been invited to the tribune. He is presented for confirmation in the position of minister of constructon of the oil and gas industry enterprises of the USSR.

Yazov Interviewed on Parliamentary Criticism

LD0307181189 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Interview with recently appointed Defense Minister Dmitry Yazov by correspondent Vycheslav Terehov in Moscow on 3 July; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] On Monday [3 July], the parliamentary session in Moscow appointed Army General Dmitry Yazov defense minister. Right after the voting, Dmitriy Yazov granted our correspondent Vycheslav Terekhov an interview for Radio Moscow listeners abroad.

The voting, as well as the discussion of Yazov's candidacy for the defense minister's post, differed considerably from the relevant procedures held earlier at the parliamentary Committee for Defense and Security Affairs. The committee had approved the army general's candidacy unanimously, while at the parliamentary session, 77 deputies voted against the appointment. Many speakers came up with highly criticial remarks addressed to the candidate.

How does the newly-appointed minister feel about all that criticism? Dmitriy Yazov: I think the parliamentary discussion of my candidacy reflected the current trend towards greater openness and democracy in this country. The critical remarks and suggestions voiced by deputies were fully correct, and I accept them unconditionally. I do understand the army is yet to solve many serious problems and a great deal of this work will depend on the defense minister, therefore, I accept criticism not as criticism as such, but rather as [word indistinct] for the defense minister's prestige, and as attention to the national Armed Forces, said Dmitriy Yazov.

Our correspondent then asked the minister if the fact that some servicemen had voted against his appointment would in any way affect their future army career?

General Yazov observed: The servicemen in question are deputies of the Soviet parliament, and no one will ever dream of spoiling their career. The fact that they criticized the defense minister and voted against me as a candidate for that post does in no way mean, now that I've received the appointment, I'll take pains to revenge myself on them. That would indeed be unethical. Besides, everything they said reflected the (?virtual) state of things in the Army. Even if I don't think the negative phenomena they mentioned are characteristic of the Soviet Armed Forces as a whole, it doesn't mean that they don't exist at all, said Dmitriy Yazov.

Our correspondent called the minister's attention to the claims that one can be heard from the Western news media and at some public rallies here in Moscow that a military coup may occur in the Soviet Union.

What is General Yazov's attitude to allegations of this kind: As Mikhail Gorbachev presented me as a candidate for the post of defense minister he vividly described the procedure of decision-taking on the major issues related to the Soviet Armed Forces. Specifically, he outlined the functions of the USSR Defense Council, which drafts the national miliary doctrine and controls its implementation, as well as supervises the developments within the Army. In these conditions all talk of a military coup is just irrelevant. I for one couldn't imagine anything of the kind happening in this country. Even if we are sometimes compared with other countries—and we all know a military coup occurred a few days ago in Sudan—one should always remember the conditions here and elsewhere are too different. A coup in the USSR is unlikely, considering the size of the country, the specific manner of Armed Forces management and many other factors. In a word, a military coup here is out of the question. I think the authors of such allegations are pursuing their own specific interests. Life is life, and the struggle of ideologies continues. I think it's into the framework of this struggle that some people would like to squeeze a controversy or two to provoke clashes between some political leaders. Radio Moscow's listeners abroad may be sure that the Soviet military have no intention whatsoever to stage any coup. Our function is to take care of this country's defense capability, said Dmitriy Yazov.

Asked how he could assess the fact that no one at the latest parliamentary session has spoken out against the policy of nuclear disarmament, General Yazov said: I think I did my best to make it clear to the deputies that this country would continue actively working for lesser nuclear stockpiles. It is the Soviet Union that initiated the process of nuclear disarmament. At the same time, one should understand that further efforts in that direction can be taken only on the basis of reciprocity. To all appearances, the Supreme Soviet supported this point of view unanimously, said Army General Yazov.

Nishanov Interviewed on Nationalities Issue

LD0407191989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1145 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Interview with Soviet of Nationalities Chairman Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov by unidentified correspondent; date and place of interview not specified—first paragraph is introduction; recorded]

[Excerpts] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session, in the chambers, the commissions and committees. In this program you will hear two interviews, with Soviet of Nationalities Chairman Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, and Supreme Soviet member; and a ship's mate from Kaliningrad, Oleg Mikhaylovich Yegorov. Talking to them are our correspondents Lyudmila Semina and Vladimir Koroblev. Here is the first interview. Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov tells us about the mechanics of the work of the Soviet of Nationalities:

[Begin recording] [Nishanov] First and foremost I would like to say that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies has given instructions in the field of interethnic relations that our policy be filled with new content. In the development of nations and interethnic relations, and in their evaluation, we must return to Lenin's tenets. There are many deformations which took shape in the period of the personality cult and in the period of stagnation. For this reason our chamber, commissions and committees must make a very careful study of matters relating to legislation so as to secure a precise, clear-cut legal definition of issues of sovereignty, economic independence, legal relations between the union and the republics. At the same time we have to resolve matters relating to autonomous formations for those nations and ethnic groups which do not have a home of their own. There are questions concerning the development of small nations, there are questions concerning the development of the language, culture and even statehood of a number of nations and ethnic groups which, in the period of the personality cult, were in effect deprived of their homeland, of their independence. [passage omitted] I think that in resolving any questions relating to interethnic relations, violence has to be excluded. Free will has to be guaranteed.

[Correspondent] That is, there should be no repetition of what happened in Nagorno-Karabakh, what happened in Sumgait and what happened in Uzbekistan?

[Nishanov] Quite right. We have to exclude such hideous phenomena from our lives.

[Correspondent] Rafik Nishanovich, I know that these commissions will be permament. To what extent will they be accessible for citizens to address them?

[Nishanov] Well, in the first place, all year round, at any time, citizens can address any committee, any commission, or any chamber, just like the Supreme Soviet Presidium. But at the present time, we have agreed on a preliminary basis that the Supreme Soviet will work until 4 August, and all of the commissions. Then there will be holidays. Somewhere round the end of September, or the beginning of October, we'll resume our work again. Besides that, we have a special committee on glasnost, on citizens' rights and appeals, consisting of 40 people. This committee is in permament operation, representatives of this committee constantly receive citizens, they deal with matters of glasnost and guaranteeing their rights, so it can be said that citizens can make an address, in effect, all year round and at any time.

[Correspondent] But still, interethnic relations have now become aggravated, and of course, the majority of citizens will, on these matters, turn to the commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. The question is, if someone comes from some republic

with some very serious problem and addresses this commission, will he be received, and will they help him resolve the questions which he addresses to these commissions?

[Nishanov] You're quite right. Just now our commission has been addressed by Turkish Meskhetians, by their representatives. Representatives of the Crimean Tatars have come. Representatives of the Kurds and a number of other nations and ethnic groups have come. The chairman of the Commission on Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations, Comrade Tarazevich, received them; the deputy chairman of the nationalities chamber of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Comrade Bisher, received them. There was an address by representatives of Caucasian nationalities which had found themselves in a difficult situation in Novyy Uzen.

In spite of the fact that we have already have plenary sessions under way, both of the Supreme Soviet and of the committees and commissions—we are forming the government—we find time to receive these representatives. On the matter of the Turkish Meskhetians, we are setting up a very representative commission. In this commission we are including representatives of the Turkish Meskhetians living in Moscow, in the Caucasus and in Uzbekistan. We are also including in this commission representatives of a number of republics in which representatives of the Turkish Meskhetians live. This commission will, in the course of 2 or 3 weeks in a very thorough manner, travel to the locality, study all circumstances, and shall examine the question both in provisional and fundamental terms: how to resolve things for the present so that they should be comfortable, and how to resolve the issue so that their main dream, to return to their homeland, might be resolved. This is a complex matter, of course, and it cannot be resolved in 1 year or at one sitting. But I am convinced that the commission will elaborate, together with the republics, such measures as might make it possible gradually, but surely, to resolve this issue. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Gorbachev, Leaders Sign Andrey Gromyko's Obituary
PM0407140589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 89 Second Edition p 3

[Obituary of A.A. Gromyko]

[Text] Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, one of our country's major politicians and statesmen and a personal pensioner of union status, has died. His long career was spent in the service of our country's interests at different periods in its complex and contradictory development.

A.A. Gromyko was born in 1909, received higher economic training in the early thirties, completed a postgraduate course, and worked from 1936 to 1939 at the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute.

A.A. Gromyko's long and fruitful diplomatic work began in 1939. During and immediately after the war he was USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States, and in the early fifties to Britain; he was the USSR's permanent representative on the UN Security Council, deputy and first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, and, in 1957, USSR foreign minister. From 1983 to 1985 he was also first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

A.A. Gromyko's diplomatic activity was widely renowned in our country and abroad. He took part in the work of the Crimea and Potsdam conferences of heads of government of the three great powers—the USSR, the United States, and Britain—in 1945. On behalf of the Soviet state he signed the the document on the creation of the United Nations. A.A. Gromyko headed the USSR delegation at many sessions of the UN General Assembly and international conferences and talks, and made a considerable contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the Soviet state's foreign policy.

A.A. Gromyko was a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet of many convocations. In July 1985 he was elected to the lofty post of Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, a post which he held until October 1988.

A.A. Gromyko joined the CPSU in 1931 and for a long time belonged to other top party organs; He was elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee at the 19th CPSU Congress and a member of the CPSU Central Committee at the 20th, 22d, and 27th congresses. From 1973 through 1988 he was a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

A.A. Gromyko actively supported the party's course of the revolutionary restructuring of Soviet society's entire life and the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th all-union party conference.

The Soviet state highly appreciated A.A. Gromyko's many years of activity in state posts: The title Hero of Socialist Labor was twice conferred on him and he was awarded seven Orders of Lenin, orders of the Labor Red Banner, the "Badge of Honor", and other medals.

The party and the Soviet people have lost a loyal son. The bright memory of Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko will remain in our hearts forever.

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.A. Medvedev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, V.M. Chebrikov, E.A. Shevardnadze, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, A.N. Yakovlev, A.P. Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Yu.D. Maslyukov, G.P. Razumovskiy, YU.F. Solovyev, N.V. Talyzin, D.T. Yazov, O.D. Baklanov, R.N. Nishanov, Ye.M. Primakov, T.A. Akmatov, V.S. Astrauskas, R.A. Bazarova, G.M. Voskanyan, A.V. Gorbunov, M.I. Ibragimov, E.M. Kafarova, A.A. Mokanu, G. Pallayev,

A.F. Ryuytel, M.R. Sagdiyev, G.S. Tarazevich, O.Ye. Cherkeziya, V.S. Shevchenko, N.Ye. Kruchina, Ye.Z. Razumov, V.M. Falin, G.V. Kolbin, S.A. Shalayev, V.I. Mironenko, YU.A. Prokofyev, M.S. Shkabardnya, A.A. Bessmertnykh, Yu.M. Vorontsov, and A.G. Kovalev.

Gromyko Funeral Commission Named

LD0307195689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newcast]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have decreed: First, for organizing Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's funeral, a government commission should be set up and its composition should include Comrade Vorotnikov as chairman, Biryukova, Razumovskiy, Prokofyev, Shkabardnya, and Bessmertnykh.

Second, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko should be buried at the Novodevichye Cemetery.

The Government Commission announces that the Red Banner Hall of the Central House of the Soviet Army will be open from 1000-1500 on 5 July for people to pay their last respects to the late Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko. The funeral of Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko will take place at 1600, on 5 July, at Novodevichye Cemetery.

Gorbachev Meets With Estonian Delegates 1 Jun

PM0307134189 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 3 Jun 89 pp 1, 3

[Report for ETA by NOORTE HAAL special correspondent T. Sildam and ETA special correspondent L. Sher: "Big Day for Estonian Delegation"]

[Text] Kremlin Palace of Congresses—An event of great importance for the people's deputies elected from our republic took place 1 June at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Immediately after the end of the congress daytime sitting they met with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

V. Vyalyas presented the Estonian deputies gathered in a small auditorium of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses to Mikhail Sergeyevich.

M. Gorbachev: What do you think of the congress?

I. Fyuk: It is a shame. People are saying that someone from Central Asia is not behaving properly; they say the same of the Muscovites and the Balts. We must realize that there are differences between regions and that therefore we should not accuse each other or give vent to emotion. We need trust between the republics and the center's trust in the republics. When we are able to bring the entire structure of the congress to the point where there is representation for the republics and regions we will feel that this is the organ of the USSR and not of some majority. Otherwise we will enter into an impasse.

V. Vyalyas: Mikhail Sergeyevich, I can say that naturally every day each deputy liaises with the republic. There is unprecedented interest there in the congress. And I must say that it is a very exacting interest. The people are waiting. But at the same time my deputy colleagues will probably agree that this interest is positive. I would say a very positive assessment is being given of the congress. People already see in it the real fruit of democratization and restructuring. Although, of course, people are approaching the congress very exactingly.

M. Gorbachev: Who else wants to say something about his attitude toward the congress?

Kh. Aasmyae: I would say, since we discussed this question yesterday, that the congress is proceeding no worse than we expected. (Laughter).

It is our common opinion that what is taking place in the auditorium reflects very accurately the situation in the country. It would also be wrong to expect too much at once.

M. Lauristin: Of course, we came here with trembling hearts. We were a little afraid that we would....

M. Gorbachev: My hands tremble sometimes, too....

M. Lauristin: Now about our main problems, about economic accountability [khozraschet], which for us is the number one problem. In my opinion we all felt how topical this is for many regions, even when we were listening to Nazarbayev and others. That is, they come out and start considering what we are thinking about, only perhaps for a little longer—that is, we have already gotten somewhere. But it can clearly be seen that this is a common problem. And it seems to me therefore that we are no longer trembling. We feel we are on the right path.

I. Raud: It is a surprising phenomenon when people, when they talk among themselves, constantly use the word "IME"—"economically accountable Estonia"—which in Estonian means "miracle."

M. Gorbachev: We shall soon have poems about economic accountability. (Laughter).

V. Palm: Economic accountability is a religion right now. (Laughter).

Ye. Kogan: Forgive me, it is by no means so for the entire population and it is by no means a religion. Among a section of the population there is a critical attitude inasmuch as this concept provides for the demolition of the USSR Constitution. The passing of laws, which does not accord with the constitution, second it was adopted without preliminary permission, without

agreement with the Supreme Soviet. [sentence as published] Third, its implementation is proceeding, and by a decision of 29 May union enterprises are even being listed in order to hand them over to the authority of the republic, although no one has asked the opinion [passage illegible] a religion for all inhabitants of the republic.

M. Gorbachev: And here is the director of the "Dvigatel" plant, too, comrades. How do you see it?

V. Yarovoy: I also believe that the idea of republican economic accountability is a good idea. We must proceed toward it. But I do not think we can proceed toward it using the methods and means by which people in our republic are striving for it.

M. Gorbachev: So in this case....

V. Yarovoy: The main thing that worries me is that we are proceeding toward constitutional opposition to the Fundamental Law of the union. I believe that this cannot be done on the path to a rule-of-law state.

M. Gorbachev: And what is your attitude toward this?

R. Otsason: I would say that when we had a nationwide discussion everyone was in favor. Well, perhaps some people did not express their opinion. That is why we later had a discussion at a sitting of the republic's Supreme Soviet. There, too, the concept was adopted unanimously. Only one person abstained. Therefore we can confidently say that the entire people are in favor. That we want to do something new and change existing laws in some respects is another matter. We cannot say that, since some particular laws exist, we can make economic accountability only within the framework of yesterday's or the day before yesterday's laws. But it seems to us that we have chosen the legally correct course: We have elaborated and adopted our own concept and elaborated our proposals for changing points of the Constitution which must be reworked in this connection. We are submitting these proposals to the congress today.

M. Gorbachev: Good. If there is such a path then I think it is the natural one. Since this thing has appeared in your republic and you have reached some degree of agreement, it is, I think, an entirely correct proposal. But if the opposite is the case, if no proposal has yet been formulated, and particular legal demands are made, when some manifestations of separatism begin to appear, then probably suspicions begin to emerge both in the center and locally, especially at union enterprises.

In general you perceive that we are in favor of the same idea. Unless we fill the republics' sovereignty with real content as regards the economy, the social sphere, political institutions, and so forth—I shall not start making a list, that is something for the future—then I think there will be no second stage. And if the second stage does not take place there will be no political reform in general.

We are now entering a very important stage of political reform which affects the union republics, autonomous formations, national okrugs, and all local soviets. Without changing their legal and actual status by introducing new laws we will reach the point where all slogans, including "Power to the soviets!", will just hang there without really adding to the republics' sovereignty. That is why we are attached to this path in political leadership.

I heard Comrade Toome yesterday. I must say it was already more considered than has been the case so far, than what I have encountered, than what has been heard in your press. This was something else.

You know what you must bear in mind: That we are connected to such an extent and we did not even suspect it. When the electrical equipment enterprise ceased to produce output in little Stepanakert, with its population of 250,000, it was felt immediately. At the time I thought: How closely we are connected!

And when Comrade Toome gave attention to the union, to the national economic complex which has taken shape, and to relations in order to fill them with new content and so that people should feel they are masters at regional and republican level.... Yet, on the other hand, that is a great responsibility, too—you are yourselves assuming responsibility to the people for how they will live. So I can see a problem. I would ask you most earnestly to proceed in the new nationalities policy from the realities which dictate much to us. In our enormous big house we must see everything. See the situation in the economy, see the situation as regards how our people feel, how all peoples and nations, great and small, are living. I would say that that is the destiny of the union, of restructuring, and of renewal.

That is why I unequivocally support the fact that a quest is under way. We merely ask you to cooperate. To cooperate and not to be suspicious. And so that a person of nonindigenous nationality in our country, whether in the Baltic republics, in Russia, or in the Ukraine, should not feel bad.

If that trust is present, we will bring all our troubles to the necessary solution. Look what headway we have made. After all, we have been studying this question thoroughly for about 2 years—I have in mind the concept, not the quest, the talking, the comparisons. Perhaps when I first came there I gave you a few ideas. (Laughs). And at the time I said that people in Estonia know how to work. I believe that today the highest per capita national income is in Estonia.

Friends, you know that when you began talking and started formulating questions and, moreover, started hurrying—I shall be frank and say hurrying—then you generated disquiet not only in your own republic but also in the union. And what happened then? After all, today the person who produces the end product is in a better position from the viewpoint of conditions, from the

ecological viewpoint, and from the viewpoint of turnover tax. So people have started thinking: But what about me? Am I going to be a raw material appendage of Estonia? They don't want to be that. And nothing will work. It is the same in the world, too. Diktat will not work any more; no one will foist anything on anyone. A balance of interests is needed. We must seek it, and that means that equilibrium is needed, trust is needed.

Now everyone knows how to count, not just the Estonians. The Uzbeks say: On our 4.5 million hectares of irrigated land we can meet our needs, the needs of our republic, in full: We can grow wheat, there is corn, there is rice, we can grow feed, alfalfa, we can obtain milk, and, finally, cotton. We have 1 million tonnes of oil cakes. And, after all, they are collected to the last kilogram to enrich the mixed feed. And 1 million tonnes of oil cakes is 1 million tonnes of meat; it is protein. And they say: Give us 1 million tonnes of meat and we will have 50 kg of meat per capita using oil cakes alone. They have begun to establish ties with China now—the Chinese give 1 tonne of meat for 1 tonne of cotton. If that's independence, then so be it. Then you can take it from us and from the Balts, too.

So I think that if we do not disrupt but enrich our relations, everything will work. Look how all Europe is proceeding along this path.

M. Lauristin: But for that each person must be strong himself and be able to trade. Because there cannot be a market if there is no master. After all, the master himself looks to see what he has, what he produces, and what he will put on the market. And if all republics have master-to-master relations with each other, we will have a union market, we will have surpluses, we will have everything. And there will perhaps be even closer relations than now, but on a healthier basis.

M. Gorbachev: I hope so.

M. Bronshteyn: May I speak? First, I am one of those migrants. (Laughter). I am from Leningrad and I have spent nearly 40 years in Estonia.

V. Vyalyas: Mikhail Sergeyevich, he is also my teacher.

M. Bronshteyn: And as a professional economist I want to say that I listened to your report and realized that your concept of economic accountability is incomparably closer to it than what was prepared by Maslyukov's commission. I say that with complete responsibility. The concept was born as a result of the action of competing groups and the exchange of opinions. It was conceived very seriously. It destroys a whole series of myths. We have no market as reliable as the union. But in this market we must be equals, like any republic. Equality is equivalent exchange. We must take part in union programs; ultimately, that is in our interests, too. But we must know what we are giving; we must not take clandestinely, in little pieces, but in a single flow, and like everyone else we must have control so that funds are not spent on "projects of the century." Next, what you were saying is very correct: It is freedom primarily for the enterprise and entrepreneurial activity of all types. And freedom for everyone, including the "Dvigatel" plant, to go out onto any markets. We have a residue-based way of thinking which believes that the union enterprise is protected by its own ministry. No, it will not protect it. Voluntary associations must be created.

Essentially we are making very good decisions at the top echelon but we are impeded by some petty official who turns our objective interest—be it in the union or in a common market—into a subjective centrifugal trend. Here is one small example: For decades we have been selling our agricultural produce, milk and meat, at the lowest prices. Yet we must buy cotton, buy iron, and buy oil....

M. Gorbachev: Also at low prices.

M. Bronshteyn: But no one asks us. Now, since the March Plenum, we have been instructed to elaborate new prices, and someone is sitting in an office and elaborating them. Next, how much to buy? Our calculations show that if the centralized food fund is reduced and direct exchange between regions is expanded, we would have more food for the country than by collecting everything for Moscow. We would give Central Asia meat and oil and would receive oil cake and vegetables. But a figure—the maximum state order—is set. It is being dissipated [razbrasyvayut]....

M. Gorbachev: In March did you pay attention to my argument about the state order? We view it as....

M. Bronshteyn: ...a temporary measure.

M. Gorbachev: And we are thinking about how to hone it and to what extent.

M. Bronshteyn: But if it is reduced by 30 percent—and I can give you the figures—it would cost you half as much to prepare it. Industrial regions could buy food while selling metal and oil. You gave a target—the state can spend so much, do the sums! I know what those bureaucrats think—some of them were graduate students of mine. They see a sum and they think: Aha. The Non-Chernozem makes a demand—it must be given more. Where can it be found? Prime cost is lower in the Baltic republics; let's make the prices lower, too.

And we, with the same conditions as Leningrad Oblast and Moscow Oblast, end up with prices 38 percent lower. That is turning into politics. Every year that is R230 million taken from our pockets.

M. Gorbachev: We have recalculated everything on the basis of world prices and so far you are R0.5 million out of pocket. And you will not deny that. And I see no problem here.

M. Bronshteyn: The problem is only one of discrimination, when the republic is not an equal partner in mutual relations and when decisions are taken by some bureaucrat in an office. And so we have gathered together and agreed on prices and adopted normal prices. On world markets we probably do indeed lose out. Because prices for raw material should be raised.

M. Gorbachev: And currency. If we said: In the next 5-year plan the socialist countries will sell only for currency, everyone would sink.

M. Bronshteyn: That obliges us to embark on resource saving, but we cannot operate by discriminatory methods.

M. Gorbachev: I fully share that idea. I ask you merely to proceed from the premise that we adhere to that line: On the political plane, too, we must supplement sovereignty, and the indigenous nationalities' morale must be good. I liked a formula from Comrade Vyalyas' report at the plenum of your Central Committee: The Estonian who has lived here for centuries must not feel bad. But the Estonian will never feel good if others next to him feel bad.

Voices: That goes without saying! Of course!

M. Gorbachev: It would be a disaster. And if you look back over the centuries when there were Russians and Estonians together around Lake Chudskoye, for instance. Half the people in the settlements there are Estonians and the other half are Slavs, and you don't look any further. That should be borne in mind.

V. Vyalyas: Mikhail Sergeyevich, when I visited you in your office and spoke about interethnic relations, I mentioned Aleksandr Bestuzhev-Marlinskiy: The Tsarist officer wrote about the poor Estonian peasant. And you are absolutely right—there can be no national isolation or separation because that is the kind of world we live in. Although of course we do have distortions.

M. Gorbachev: I will tell you how perturbed the reaction to this is if people feel some kind of disrespect somewhere. It offends that which is most human, that which lies deepest. At one or another meeting in the Ukraine, someone advanced some slogans. They became well known. Hurled out during a polemic, in a rage, as has happened in your republic, too—"Occupiers!" Surely someone who has come to work at a plant is not an occupier? This has crept into your republic, too. But in my opinion the situation is now already better. If any question of interethnic relations is put so rudely, so disrespectfully, then everything we have in common with you could be ruined. And we will not make headway but cast ourselves backward. This state does not suit us right now; we must make it harmonious so that people feel good. I see a great deal of common sense in the People's Front and I think dialogue is needed between the People's Front and the International Movement. And Comrade Vyalyas and the Communist Party need dialogue with the People's Front and with the International Movement. Seek contacts as at the congress, talk and argue. You were right to say that we can discuss the most acute issues. But only while respecting each other, not through ultimatums. If there is a question which worries you right now I think we will find a way of reaching an understanding.

A. Ryuytel: I should like to say a couple of words. This is the right place to assure you that this direction—not issuing ultimatums to each other—is absolutely correct. And this direction has been taken in the republic. And I should also like to say that the foundation for normalizing the situation in our republic—and as USSR people's deputies we bear tremendous responsibility for this—is contained in what Indrek Toome said in his speech....

M. Gorbachev: I listened to him attentively and I was interested and I can see more constructiveness, more concern for our common home. Your proposals are interesting to others. But one must consider that this was only my impression from hearing it.

A. Ryuytel: I should very much like the congress to adopt at least a short document approving our positions. I think I can assure you on behalf of all deputies and all inhabitants of the republic that we are indeed on the front line of restructuring.

M. Gorbachev: I see my mission in moving forward the restructuring which has been started, to get to the end. If I feel that I am not being of any use, I shall raise the question myself. I shall not become another tsar of some kind; that is stupid. If I were seeking autocracy I would not have become the initiator of what brought us to this congress, which is opening up new roads for socialism and for our union.

I am prepared to listen to everyone and to discuss everything, but on one condition. We have the criteria, our choice is correct—everything must be within the framework of socialism. And it authorizes a great deal. I feel that the working class will simply not accept anything else. At one time we neglected the cooperative movement and neglected all its mechanisms and were unable to create an economic and legal environment for the movement to proceed normally. And many scroungers ended up there. The workers immediately saw in this a threat to socialism. And if someone really does threaten socialism and Soviet power, nothing will come of it, the people will not give their support. So let's have socialism and the union—as we want to understand it intelligently so that everyone should feel good—and democracy and glasnost—and we shall find answers to all questions.

Your worker representative....

Voices: Saar.

M. Gorbachev: Saar says: "Mikhail Sergeyevich, but what if strong republics mean a strong union!" I say let that be the case; it is a dialectical connection. Just try to be strong in the republic if the union is weak. It is a living dialectic. That is why I would not go either way. And do you remember when this formula was born? At the Presidium sitting....

A. Ryuytel: On 26 November. I would like to say that we assure you that even then everything was done from the best of intentions to make life go forward.

M. Gorbachev: Submit considered, responsible proposals, but set an example of depth, responsibility, and respect for the law.

M. Bronshteyn: But the union law must also set us an example.

V. Vyalyas: Mikhail Sergeyevich, thank you very much. As you can see, democracy in our country is such that it takes your breath away, that I kept quiet and the people spoke. But I want to say one thing. You once asked rhetorically: Am I not to blame for the fact that Estonia is in a hurry and is going forward; was I not the instigator in that sense? And I must say you were.

M. Gorbachev: You have found the culprit. (Laughter).

V. Vyalyas: And we will move restructuring forward.

M. Gorbachev: I hope so. But I can see that in the country, and that includes Estonia, there are people who want to implement their ambitions, which are a long way from what we have been talking about today. And that must not be allowed to develop. And I ask you about that. All the rest, I can assure you, we will resolve.

A. Aruvald: Come yourself. See for yourself.

M. Gorbachev: I have an invitation to Khiyumaa Island. I must find the time and go.

In concluding the conversation, which lasted 42 minutes, M.S. Gorbachev made a pledge to the republic's journalists, promising to answer all their questions when he comes to Estonia. Inasmuch as this was said in front of witnesses, including A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who took part in the meeting, we believe we have the right to tie a firm knot in our handkerchief to remind us.

Gorbachev, Others Sign Georgian Singer's Obituary

PM1606085189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 89 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary of Rashid Madzhid ogly Beybutov]

[Excerpts] The multinational Soviet culture has sustained a heavy loss. USSR People's Artist Rashid Madzhid ogly Beybutov, one of the major exponents of musical art, has died after a long illness.

R.M. Beybutov was born in Tbilisi into the family of a folk singer in 1915. [passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.A. Medvedev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, V.M. Chebrikov, E.A. Shevardnadze, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, A.N. Yakovlev, A.P. Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Yu.D. Maslyukov, G.P. Razumovskiy, Yu.F. Solovyev, N.V. Talyzin, D.T. Yazov, O.D. Baklanov, R.N. Nishanov, Ye.M. Primakov, A.S. Kapto, V.G. Zakharov, A.Kh. Vezirov, A.A. Alizade, I.K. Arkhipova, F.Yu. Akhmedova, F.Sh. Badalbeyli, P.Sh. Burchuladze, P. Byul-Byul ogly, R.S. Gadzhiyev, R.Ya. Zeynalov, L.M. Imanov, F.E. Kasimova, M.M. Magomayev, A.D. Melkov, A.N. Mutalibov, E.A. Saturyan, Ye.S. Serkebayev, S.B. Tatliyev, Z.Ya. Khanlarova, and T.N. Khrennikov.

Vorotnikov Addresses Chelyabinsk Officials 1 Jul

LD0107193889 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] Chelyabinsk, South Urals, July 1 TASS—Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Politburo member of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and parliamentary deputy, met party and local government officials of the Chelyabinsk region on Saturday.

Speaking about the recent first Congress of USSR People's Deputies, Vorotnikov said that the congress reflected the alignment of forces characteristic of the whole of society.

"No doubt, those who resolutely support perestroyka and favour far-reaching reforms in various spheres and further development of democratisation, predominate in society," he said.

"However, there are also people who declare their support for perestroyka but in actual fact mean renunciation of socialist principles. Some of these pseudo-democrats hide their real intentions, others frankly say they are struggling for power.

"One must not underestimate the influence of these groups on the climate in society and people's sentiments," Vorotnikov said.

"It is these forces that are making attempts to defame communists. Attacks on the party should be regarded, above all, as a signal for a decisive invigoration of all our work," he went on.

In Vorotnikov's view, a multi-party system in our conditions did not justify itself. "To try to revive it would be a mistake," he pointed out, adding that "only one road lies before us—strengthening the positions of the Communist Party and improving forms of its work as the political vanguard of society."

Asked whether there are other political forces in the Soviet Union that could guarantee society's harmonious development, coordination of all socio-political processes and cooperation between different parts of the multi-nation state, Vorotnikov answered: "There are no such forces."

Vorotnikov also spoke about what is to be done in the legislative sphere. He said legislative acts are to be drafted in which "the principle of the soviet's unlimited power in the economic, social and political spheres of life, and measures to overcome departmentalism and parochialism will be consistently and concretely expressed."

"Preparations for new elections to republican and local [words indistinct] power, held most probably next spring, are acquiring prime importance now," he said.

"The Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation is drafting a new law on elections. We're going to take into account the experience of the elections of USSR people's deputies, their positive and negative aspects.

"It is necessary to ensure such procedures as will make it possible to choose the worthiest candidates and elect the best of them to the soviets," Vorotnikov said.

He told the meeting about plans to improve political structures, set up republican bodies of some public organisations in the Russian Federation, and extend the rights of the republic's Council of Ministers.

In his view, changes are ripe also in the Russian Federation's administrative-territorial setup.

Vorotnikov called for improvement of the structure of executive bodies of soviets at all levels. He said proposals are being worked out for improving the structure of ideological institutions, the press, television and radio.

He described as topical the issue of considerably raising the legal status of autonomous units and transferring some of the federation's rights to them.

"There are plans to extend and strictly define rights and responsibilities of autonomous republics and regions and create guarantees for the protection of the interests of all autonomous units," Vorotnikov said.

Resolution on Repression Victims Adopted

LD0307174489 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee has adopted a resolution on perpetuating the memory of those who fell victim to repressions of the 30s, 40s and early 50s. It says that much is being done in this country for completely rehabilitating all the victims of repressions of the 30s, 40s and early 50s, for the sake of restoring historic and social justice. Measures are being taken for effectively ensuring the rights of rehabilitated persons and their relatives and compensating them for the losses incurred. Monuments to victims of repressions are being created and cemeteries are being opened.

At the same time, according to the letters and applications coming to the Central Committee, in some republics, regions and districts the work for perpetuating the memory of victims of repressions is being carried out not as effectively and consistently as it should.

The Central Committee suggested that the central republican party organisations, as well as communists working at local government bodies step up their work for perpetuating the memory of victims of repressions, including those who died in exile. It was recommended to take necessary measures for recognizing their burial places as official cemeteries, for creating monuments and building memorial complexes.

Checheno-Ingush Obkom Elects New First Secretary

LD0107192389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 01 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A plenum of the Checheno-Ingush CPSU Oblast Committee [obkom] was held today in Groznyy to examine an organizational matter. Following the election of Comrade Fotayev to the post of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals, he has been released from his duties as obkom first secretary. Comrade Zavgayev, formerly second secretary of the Checheno-Ingush Obkom, has been elected obkom first secretary.

Biryukova Attends Medical Workers Day Meeting

LD1506212889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jun 89

[Text] A ceremonial meeting in Moscow today, dedicated to the Day of the Medical Worker, has been discussing the implementation of an active social policy on safeguarding and strengthening the health of Soviet people. In the presidium were Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, senior workers of the Party Central Committee, leaders of ministries and departments, and district doctors and nurses, all of whom are realizing the restructuring of national health care.

Fergana Curfew Eased; 'Extremists' Still Active

LD0407110689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0944 GMT 04 Jul 89

[Text] Fergana, 4 July (TASS)—The curfew has been lifted in the majority of population centers of Fergana Oblast in Uzbekistan. This measure [words garbled] ago in connection with the interethnic clashes between Uzbeks and Turkish Meskhetians living here, which led

to about 100 human casualties. The curfew has been shortened in the towns of Fergana, Margilan, Kokand, and Kuvasay. Industrial, trade, and public catering enterprises in the oblast are working normally. Cinemas are open. The grain harvest is nearing completion on the fields, and tending of the cotton crop is under way. There is a lively trade in fruit and vegetables at the markets.

However, the danger that excesses will be repeated has not yet been eliminated. Many inhabitants are requesting that the internal troops should not be withdrawn. As Colonel General Yurly Shatalin, commander of Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, has stated, the curfew will be completely revoked at the population's wish, when all the individuals involved in inciting interethnic strife, robberies, murders, and pogroms have been detained, and when there is no threat of their repetition. Fifty-six criminal cases have been instituted. More than 30 murders have come to light, and the persons who committed them have been indentified. It is expected that trials will begin in the near future.

Workers of the oblast are taking an active part in maintaining order. Workers' detachments numbering 12,000 persons have been set up at enterprises.

But as Lieutenant Colonel Aleksandr Tatsitov, a spokesman for the press center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, reported, the extremists have not abandoned their attempts to destabilize the situation. They are spreading provocatory rumors and blackmailing people. Telephone threats are being made against militia workers and people of Uzbek nationality who helped Meshketian Turks and rescued their children. Anonymous letters are being sent around with calls to boycott work and to ignore the local authorities. In one of the streets of Margilan two hooligans armed with bicycle chains attacked an Uzbek girl for going out in European dress. There have been attempts to set fire to houses inhabited by Meskhetian Turks.

Party, soviet, and law enforcement bodies are jointly undertaking extensive preventative and explanatory work with the population. All measures are being taken to ensure citizens' safety and the normalization of life in the oblast.

General Describes Arms Use During Fergana Crisis

LD0407133989 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov:

Soviet Interior Ministry troops opened fire on six occasions during mass ethnic disturbances in Uzbekistan's Fergana region last June, it was revealed at a news conference here today.

Major-General Aleksandr Griyenko, who is a member of the Military Council of the ministry's forces, told newsmen that the use of arms in all cases was absolutely justified, as shown by an investigation conducted by the prosecutor's office.

Soldiers fired only at specific extremists as they were trying to attack them.

According to Griyenko, weapons were not used against people during mass disturbances in Nagorno-Karabakh, Sumgait, Georgia and Kazakhstan.

Griyenko said that the 300,000-strong troops of the Interior Ministry are assigned to curb violations of public order if they are large-scale, pose a threat to life, disorganise the work of enterprises and are directed at destroying state, public or personal property. [Words indistinct] interior troops to use arms only as an extreme measure.

Newsmen were shown photographs devoted to the developments in the Fergana valley. In the pictures are destroyed and burnt houses, smashed cars and charred bodies—all done by extremists.

The General said that three soldiers sustained gunshot wounds and 161 were injured. 103 civilians were killed, 754 houses, 28 state facilities and 275 cars were burnt or looted.

700 people were detained for breaking the peace and 9,092 for violating curfew regulations. About 10,000 guns were confiscated.

A total of 511 Interior Ministry servicemen were wounded in the mass unrest that hit various parts of the nation since last February (in Sumgait).

On the supply of interior troops with riot-control gear, Gen. Griyenko said that their equipment comprised bullet-proof vests, plastic and metal shields, rubber truncheons, all types of cold steel, short-barrel fire-arms, water cannon and Cheryomukha tear gas.

Rules of their use are determined not only by the Interior Ministry, but also by the Ministry of Justice and the Health Ministry of the USSR.

Griyenko emphasised that despite the difference in the names of the tear gas, its basis is Chloroacetophenone with a various degree of sublimation.

Last year, Interior Ministry forces used it more than 1,000 times. Not a single fact of a long-term effect on health, to say nothing of lethal outcomes, has been registered.

Nagorno-Karabakh Situation 'Remains Tense'

LD0507092189 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Stepanakert July 4 TASS—The situation in Nagorno-Karabakh remains tense as demands for this autonomous region's reunification with Armenia, disbandment of the special government committee and the restoration of the rights of the region's party and local government bodies are made at rallies in the regional centre.

Stepanakert has been paralysed by a strike for two months. Industrial enterprises and construction projects, organisations and institutions do not work. Road transport is partially idle.

The city's economy fell short of producing 25 million roubles worth of items, most of which were intended for the region itself.

The strike hits hard the population. About 300 flats and a kindergarten were not commissioned. About ten million roubles of capital investment were not used with unique equipment and road- building machinery standing idle.

The city residents' money incomes diminished by 35 million roubles. The plight of refugees is especially dismal. The economic situation in the autonomous region is being exacerbated by the drought that affected fodder crops and pastures and is threatening to inflict heavy damage on rural cooperatives.

Local inter-ethnic conflicts in areas inhabited by Armenians and Azerbaijanis, the disquieting situation on the roads, ill-considered publications from both sides and unauthorised demonstrations and rallies greatly complicate the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh.

The special government committee and law-enforcement forces in the special region, which is Nagorno-Karabakh, are adopting measures to normalise the situation and restrain emotions.

Georgian-Azerbaijani Tensions Noted in Georgia

PM0507103989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 6

[Special correspondent V. Arsenyev report: "Displaying Reason"]

[Text] A tense situation has persisted for several days now in Georgia's Marneulskiy, Bolnisskiy, and Dmanisskiy rayons, where relations between Georgians and Azerbaijanis, who have resided there for a long time, have become complicated. The situation is being monitored by the republic's internal affairs organs. More than 3,000 staffers of the militia and internal troops have been transferred here from Tbilisi and other rayons to patrol the highways and maintain order in the cities and villages. Representatives of the republic's party leadership and government are in Marneuli and Bolnisi, meeting with and talking to people.

Information as to what is happening in Georgia's hottest spot today can be gleaned from reports produced by the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs press group, which are published daily by local newspapers and broadcast on radio and television. It was announced, for instance, that throughout this time 51 firearms, 350 nonfirearms, 12 petrol bombs, and 60 smoke hand grenades have been confiscated in Marneulskiy and Bolnisskiy Rayons. Informal associations, which also wish the conflict to end as soon as possible, are also producing their own information.

I spoke with Shota Gorgodze, the republic's minister of internal affairs. He believes that it will be possible to prevent an undesirable development of events and set people's minds at rest. At any rate only efficient actions on the part of law-enforcement organs and great explanatory work on the part of party and soviet organs are enabling the situation to be kept stable.

Economist on Economic Independence in Georgia

LD2206104389 Moscow TASS in English 0843 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Tbilisi June 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Alla Kokaya:

The openness and democratisation of Soviet society, which have given scope to a free exchange of views, also made possible the current discussion in Georgia about the content of the 'republic's economic independence' notion.

"The very term has emerged during the restructuring process and under its direct impact. We in Georgia fully support the idea of economic independence and believe that a successful development of the republic's economy is impossible without it," said Professor Valerian Advadze, director of the Georgian Institute of Economics.

The 58-year-old scientist is heading a group of Georgian economists who have worked out an alternative concept of republican cost accounting and self-financing, which does not quite coincide with the Georgian government's stand on all points. Divergences concern ways the role and the powers of the centre and individual republics are understood.

Of course, the centre should be strong, Advadze believes, but it may not be stronger than the republics. Otherwise their independence will turn into an empty phrase.

The question of economic relationships between republics and regions, on the one hand, and the centre, on the other, deserves, in the opinion of the Georgian public, a serious and all-round study.

This is why Advadze got an opportunity to set up his own school in Georgian economic science. The school has brought together young economists who think like him. The team is now busy working out proposals which will be brought up for discussion.

"The radical economic reform is already introducing changes to our life", Advadze said. "Economic cost accounting and self-financing, cooperatives, and the lease contract have added a certain dynamism to the economy."

"It is essential to develop this process. With this end in view, it is thought necessary to 'give a free hand' to the republics. Our concept of republican economic sovereignty opens up such an opportunity."

Independent Television Company NIKA Established
LD2106224389 Moscow World Service in English 0210 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [announcer] Just a few years ago the emergence of a television [TV] company independent from the state-run organization would have been something like heresy. But today the NIKA TV company does exist. Now some details about it.

Radio and television are in the hands of a national committee here. Although the public has welcomed the committee's improved output, people believe television must become much more exciting. Now what is NIKA TV already offering, and what is it expected to offer in time? We've taken the question to the president of the company, (Nikolay Lutchenko).

[(Lutchenko), speaking in Russian with superimposed English translation] NIKA TV believes it must make television more attractive and enjoyable. It expects to promote cable television nationwide. It's going to go on the air with its own programs, including show biz and advertisments. And it intends to take part in making quality TV sets and videotape recorders in time; finance the training of TV reporters; and build a top-notch TV center of its own.

[Announcer] One more question to (Nikolay Lutchenko), president of this country's only independent TV company. What does NIKA stand for? Is it a tribute to the ancient times, or a kind of token of victory?

[(Lutchenko)] We also didn't spell it out. We wanted people to use their imagination. I can tell you that NIKA has no connection with the Greek goddess of victory. It's an abbreviation of an independent television news channel. Some even felt NIKA stood for the name of the author of the idea (and commented) we don't want to scare off the goddess of victory. We hope she will help us.

I only hope we won't get drowned in that flow of information that's going to engulf us with the appearance of more TV stations.

Television Chairman Notes Goals
LD1706194189 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 2200 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] [Announcer] The appearance in the Soviet Union of a TV company independent from the state such as NIKA TV—Independent TV Production Company—even a few years ago would have been inconceivable and almost like heresy. We now have a report from our correspondent, Yevgeniy Dektyarenko. What will NIKATV do? What does it have to offer? We put these questions to the company's chairman, (Nikolay Lutchenko):

[Dektyarenko] At NIKA TV, (Nikolay Lutchenko) says, we consider our job to be the expansion of the framework of traditional TV, making more interesting and much better programs. We propose the development of cable TV in the Soviet Union. One of the company's sections will be devoted to the organization of concerns with publicity and everything. Nor do we rule out the possibility of taking part one day in the manufacture of high-qualty TV sets and video equipment in our country. In time, the company could also invest in the training of TV journalists and could even begin in the schools.

How do you intend to reach your viewers? Your task poses many technical problems. Are you going to build your own TV center or do you intend to rent premises and equipment from the Ministry of Communications?

I will reply with a question, (Nikolay Lutchenko) said. Do you think it is better to live in your own apartment or in a rented one? Obviously, we have to build our own center and equip it with the latest equipment in order to really compete, not with national radio and TV but with direct transmission foreign satellites. NIKA is the Russian version of the name of the Greek goddess of victory, Nike. The initials, NIKA TV, are decoded into Independent TV channel.

Satellite Communications Receiving Station Assembled
LD1606152489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Color televisions are being used by oilmen in the Caspian Range. A "Moskva" satellite communications system receiving station has been assembled in the settlement of Kamyshlydzha, in the western part of the republic. It works automatically and relays color broadcasts. Powerful repeater stations are now being built in the parts of the republic furthest from the center: Gasan-Kuli, Guardak, and Bakharden Rayon.

National Engineering Federation Founded in Moscow
PM1606085989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 89 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Engineers' Federation"]

[Text] The country's technical intelligentsia has a new creative organization. The USSR Engineering Federation [Inzhenernaya Federatsiya] was created by a constituent congress held in Moscow 9 June.

"Only the best-qualified specialists from the country's engineering community will belong to it," D. Levchuk, chairman of the organizing bureau in charge of staging the congress and secretary of the board of the USSR union of scientific and engineering societies, said. "I would note that such societies exist in many countries. Admission to them is by means of rigorous selection.

"Our federation's goal is to utilize the creative potential of engineers as actively as possible so as to help labor collectives to successfully resolve the key problems of technical progress. This will be done by supplying them with the latest design studies and technologies on a contract basis and by creating economically accountable scientific and technical service centers and temporary creative collectives.

"The federation will defend its members' creative, social, and legal interests, provide them with privileges and services, and enhance their professional and economic expertise. This will cost a considerable amount of money. The new union's activity will be based on self-financing and cost recovery."

The constituent congress ratified the USSR Engineering Federation's charter. Hero of Socialist Labor V.Ye. Sokolov, Lenin Prize winner and USSR deputy minister of general machine building, was elected chairman of the central board.

Figures on Criminals' Confiscated Weapons Reported
LD0107203689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 1 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Before the next report, here are some figures from the country's Ministry of Internal Affairs: Each year, up to 3,000 firearms are confiscated from criminals.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Bakarinov] This arsenal, which ranges from sabres dating back to the times of Tsar Nikolay to modern Kalashnikov automatics currently used by the Army, was confiscated from a group of criminals active in Moscow Oblast. [Video shows rows of guns and knives laid out on a table]

After the reports by the country's Main Administration for Criminal Investigation, we expected to see piles of weapons, but that was not the case. It turns out that virtually all of them are destroyed.

This pistol recently was confiscated from a criminal. Many murders have been committed with it. It had been stolen from a militia officer.

[V.P. Bomonin, deputy head of the Main Administrative for Criminal Investigation of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs] Weapons are stolen from shooting galleries, schools, and Army subunits. There have been several instances in which weapons were stolen from law enforcement officials. There have been several instances of criminals getting hold of weapons from members of the public at the site of battles fought during the Great Patriotic War.

People can be held responsible for the illegal possession, carrying, and manufacture of firearms and explosives. The penalties are quite heavy: up to 5 years' deprivation of liberty. Nevertheless, a certain section of the population unfortunately continues to hold weapons illegally. At the same time, anyone who illegal possesses a weapon and who gives it voluntarily up is not held criminally responsible.

[Bakerinov] Each year, you confiscate a huge quantity of these firearms, but presumably the more you confiscate the fewer should be left. So there ought to be less chance of them being used?

[Bomonin] Nevertheless, criminals still hold weapons, weapons obtained from the sources I mentioned. All of us would like for there to be as few crimes as possible, but unfortunately we still have a long way to go before this matter is resolved. [end recording]

We would like to supplement that report with the following figures from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs: Last year alone firearms were used in 3,609 crimes. Twenty percent of these were premeditated murders; 6 percent were grievous bodily harm; 9 percent were robberies with violence.

Paper Includes Material in Kumyk Language
LD2206104989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Not in two languages as usual, but in three—Chechen, Russian, and Kumyk—the newspaper 'KRASNOYE ZNAMYA' has been published for the first time in Gudermesskiy Rayon, Chechen-Ingushetiya. One of the best in the autonomous republic, this paper has taken account of the wishes of representatives of Kumyk nationality, a population living closely together in Braguny and (Darbankhi).

It has given them one page of material in their native language. [passage omitted]

Optina Hermitage Monastery Fully Restored
LD0207200789 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 2 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Kaluga July 2 TASS—By TASS Correspondents Yuriy Solyanikov and Viktor Khoteyev:

Exactly a year has passed since the time when on a decree of Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all-Russia, Archimandrite Evlogii (Smirnov), professor and prorector of

the Moscow theological Academy became prior of the Optina Hermitage Monastery in the Kaluga region turned over by the Soviet Government to the Russian Orthodox Church.

In connection with the fact that there have been several publications and broadcasts of the Western media about the course of the monastery's restoration, the TASS correspondents asked Archimandrite Evlogii to comment on these reports.

"The rebirth of the Optina Hermitage is a new page in the monastery's history", the archimandrite said. "Therefore the interest of the media in our country and abroad in the Optina Hermitage is quite understandable. But it is with far from all assertions that one can agree. What construction can be put on the statement made in a broadcst of Liberty Radio station that the situation in the monastery is alarming and spiritually unstable? Or what about the assertion of the newspaper RUSSKAYA MISL that appears in France that we lack funds for the restoration of the monastery?"

"I can say firmly that we have funds. The lion's share of donations comes from dioceses. The Kaluga and Borovsk diocese headed by Bishop Ilian should be singled out. It donated over 20 thousand roubles for the monastery's restoration last year. All this enables us to increase the scope of work," Archimandrite Evlogii said.

"The process of perestroyka has a positive impact on the life of the church", Archimandrite Evlogii said in conclusion. "We have all realised the need for expanding everything beautiful that Russia has given us. We cannot but be gladdened that the requirements for man's moral purity increased in society. The beneficial process of democratisation is consonant with evangelical ideals," he said.

Economic

Economy Should Be Geared to Human Needs

PM0307145789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by doctor of economic sciences Professor Yu. Yakovets, chief of a department at the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy, under the rubric "This Was Discussed at the Congress": "Inverting the Pyramid"]

[Text] Moscow—"Initiative from above" has prevailed in our country for decades. It only remained for us to unanimously approve the center's proposed plans, programs, and construction projects for gigantic plants, power plants, dams, and canals. This created hothouse conditions for the flourishing of economic voluntarism, a mania for hare-brained administrative projects, and a monopoly on power by departments, who passed off their own interests as the state's interests. This system of management ultimately also led to protracted stagnation and a crisis situation within the economy.

The situation has changed drastically now. In an endeavor to secure compensation, as it were, for its years-long submissiveness, the public both at central and local level continually and categorically rejects construction projects for new plants, power plants, and irrigation systems and is seeking to close existing enterprises that are detrimental to the environment and people's health. It is becoming impossible to manage in the old way without taking stock of people's interests and public opinion. Moreover, the demand for an urgent solution to the social problems that have accumulated is being voiced with increasing impatience.

One can, of course, kindle demands for consumer needs and everyday requirements to be satisfied. Yet **the main thing now is not to divide up the impoverished pie of national wealth using economic accountability [khozraschet], taxes, and prices but to increase the size of this pie more rapidly**. Moreover, national wealth must not be judged in terms of tonnes of petroleum and ore extracted, steel smelted, and cement, mineral fertilizers, or grain produced but in terms of the finished product for personal consumption: food and nonfood commodities, and paid and unpaid services for the population, which must be of a contemporary standard and of the requisite quality.

Moreover, this must be done under quite harsh conditions. Labor resources are practically showing no increase and the level of workers' qualifications is by no means always up to modern requirements. Natural resources are overstretched and the best are running out. The environmental situation in many regions has gone beyond the critical stage. The production apparatus at most enterprises reflects the technological level of yesterday or earlier. Construction and transport are operating to the limit (and often beyond it) of their potential capacities, which violates the entire reproduction process. The administrative-bureacuratic system of planning and management that has developed over the decades is incapable of either strategic breakthroughs or of "mild" regulation of reproduction using economic methods. The level of economic cadres' competence is patently inadequate to rapidly solve new complex problems.

How can we escape from this mass of contradictions? **The main way appears to be through effecting the social conversion of the economy and gearing all its echelons in a rapid and balanced fashion to saturating the market and meeting people's requirements.**

The term "conversion" [konversiya] (transformation) is usually employed to mean the transfer of the military industry to the production of nonmilitary output. But in English there are broader concepts of economic conversion (restructuring of the entire economy), industrial conversion (transformation of industry), and professional conversion (change in the nature of cadre training). This article uses the term "social conversion of the economy" in this broad context, which is nearer to the concept of socially reorienting the economy and fills it with concrete substance.

It is time to invert the pyramid of priorities in economic policy and economic practice. Defense needs and the requirements of heavy industry were at the top of the pyramid for decades, while sectors directly meeting the population's requirements were at the bottom (although the slogan "All for Man" was invariably proclaimed).

Transferring a considerable proportion of the military economy to a peaceful track is the core of social conversion. The scale of this conversion and its effect on the entire reproduction process is much broader and deeper than imagined.

Data on military spending was made public for the first time at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. We are also now aware of the structure of military spending. The military economy does not just mean the highly-developed defense industry with its contemporary production apparatus and highly-skilled cadres. It also means the elite section of intellectual potential, defense construction, military transport, and the maintenance of millions of people in the Army of the most employable age. Of course, military equilibrium cannot be maintained and the country's independence and external conditions for its economic development cannot be ensured without modern defense systems. But it is equally obvious that the exaggerated development of military spending in peacetime is an excessive burden on the economy, takes the best resources away from social programs, and is in many respects brought about by the fact that this large and rapidly developing sector of the national economy is monopolized and closed to people's control. Restructuring and the social reorientation of the economy have also encroached upon this sphere: Saving on defense spending will total almost R30 billion this 5-year plan in comparison with the agreed plan, while by 1995 the government intends to reduce the proportion of defense spending in national income by a factor of 1.5-2.

The following question arises: How are we to dispose of the released potential in a thrifty manner? It would be a mistake to set about closing defense institutes, design bureaus, plants, and construction and transport organizations, thus releasing people and material resources and channeling them into subdivision II facilities and facilities in the social sphere. This means of conversion is the longest and most wasteful. Another way seems more effective: the retooling of existing labor collectives to develop and produce new-generation household equipment and materials, equipment for the light and food industries, the construction of housing and sociocultural facilities, the shipping of economic freight, and so on. The costs of restructuring are also unavoidable here but they will be much fewer than with the first option.

Every enterprise, association, and scientific organization in the defense sector is faced with the a problem of considerable difficulty, namely that of choosing a new configuration for its activity and its position on the market for nonmilitary output. It must be said bluntly that most economic managers are not ready for this as yet: They have become accustomed to regular generous clients and are unable to analyze and forecast the market situation and form prices for goods and services taking the population's demand into consideration. Even the economic mechanism works against conversion: Production volumes and labor productivity fall, and wages funds and economic incentives are being cut with the transition to nonmilitary output.

A precise long-term program for the conversion of the military economy based on scientific forecasts of the population's changing needs is needed (not so much a directive as a suggestive program to orient labor collectives). We must obviously single out the consumer "gaps" where considerable unsatisfied demand has been recorded and where the technological potential of defense sectors can be utilized to the greatest effect. These are above all video equipment (video recorders, video playbacks, camcorders, cassettes, optical discs, holograms, and so on); personal computers, microcalculators, and solar-powered watches; domestic microwave ovens, electronic games, 3-D televisions, facsimile machines, and so on. Another area is mass production of goods for the family at home—dachas, linoleum, furniture, food processors, bicycles, and many other things. Of course, marketing predictions are needed not only on a countrywide scale but also for every region and every enterprise and association in the defense industry.

To convert the military economy defense enterprises' production capacities will obviously need to be retooled and technologically reconstructed and cadres retrained. This, of course, involves additional expenditure. The sale of the new output on the markets must be organized quickly in order to reduce this expenditure to a minimum. It is very important to select the list of new commodities in a well-founded manner—taking their selling prospects into consideration along with their technological compatibility with previous production. All defense enterprises will have to engage in marketing, learn the art of making predictions and calculating the demand for their output, and submit to market demands.

I think that the role of heavy industry in the Soviet economy should also be viewed in the light of conversion. These sectors have undergone exaggerated development in our country and mainly operate for themselves and for defense sectors. Countless natural resources are channeled here along with the lion's share of the best manpower resources and investments. I can cite the following statistics to confirm this.

The proportion of heavy industry in overall industrial output rose from 60 percent in 1970 to 69.3 percent in 1987, while the proportion of heavy industry in industrial fixed capital has reached 89.3 percent. The proportion of capital investments in overall investments in the production of means of production (Group A) rose in the same period from 29.9 to 32.4 percent, whereas capital investments in consumer goods production (Group B)

fell from 5.3 to 4.1 percent. Moreover the return from investments in Group A is falling rapidly: Over 7 years investments in the fuel and power-engineering complex have risen by 71 percent while fuel extraction and electricity production rose by 18 percent and 29 percent respectively.

People try to excuse such distortions in structural and investment policy by reason of the shortage of heavy industry output. But it is time to acknowledge that this is a mythical shortage, skillfully maintained by and beneficial for these highly-monopolized sectors. It has been brought about by extravagant use of material resources. Thus, in comparison with the United States, per unit of national income, we consume 130 percent more oil and natural gas, 210 percent more steel, 180 percent more mineral fertilizers, 160 percent more cement, and 200 percent more cotton fabric. It is easy to estimate that with these material resources the country could produce at least twice as much national income and also twice as much output for personal consumption. We simply do not need as much steel, oil, cement, mineral fertilizers, and commercial lumber. It is time to set about effecting a reasonable reduction in the physical tonnage of this output while substantially increasing the quality of the remaining tonnage and replacing primary with secondary raw materials on a large scale.

There is an alternative, as in the defense sectors: We could shut down a number of enterprises in the extraction and fuel and power-engineering sectors and even some heavy machine building and construction organizations, or convert them to consumer goods production and housing construction. The second path seems more effective here (although it is not acceptable everywhere for technical reasons). Mining enterprises may reprocess spoilheaps, sludge, and other waste products to form construction materials for sociocultural and housing construction. A considerable proportion of the capacities from the construction materials industry and construction industry must be switched to these purposes. Investment in developing production of plastics, chemical fibers, and household chemicals can be increased many times by reducing mineral fertilizer production.

Agro-industrial complex sectors seem to have been directly geared to satisfying the population's requirements. However, on attentive analysis it transpires that this is not at all the case. Only a small proportion of the output of fields and farms (potatoes, fresh fruit and vegetables, eggs) is sold directly to the population. The overwhelming proportion of agricultural output is used as raw material for the food industries and light industries and it is only after processing that it reaches the consumer, having suffered vast losses in the harvesting, shipment, storage, and processing stages. While producing 40 percent of output, agricultural processing enterprises, trade outlets, and public catering possess only 17 percent of the agro-industrial complex' fixed production capital. The technical backwardness of these sectors, the low capital-labor ratio, poor roads, and shortage of transport are the cause of the great losses. Agriculture's share of agro-industrial complex investment now amounts to 80 percent. It would obviously be worth speeding up a regrouping in favor of processing sectors and highway construction.

It is not only a matter of investment but also of production structure and the criteria for its effectiveness. It is important to increase agricultural production's thrust toward the market and the end consumer.

Our country harvests the most sugar beet in the world (90.4 million tonnes), produces the most granulated sugar from Soviet raw materials (8.5 million tonnes), and its per capita consumption is above the rational norm. At the same time we spend more than 3 billion foreign-currency rubles on importing raw sugar, which provides for more than one-fourth of domestic consumption. What is this, tender concern for the needs of hooch manufacturers? Having harvested 45 percent more wheat than the United States in 1987, we are buying wheat from that country, while feeding some of it to livestock in the most irrational fashion.

Sugar beet harvest and delivery indicators in physical tonnes (disregarding the sugar content), the lack of real monitoring of the nitrate content in vegetables, the orientation to livestock numbers in livestock farming (this would be justified if horns and hooves were the main output)—this must all be overcome, while assessing the results of the work in terms of the quantity, quality, and price of the products reaching the consumer. The development of agrofirms, agrocombines, and direct outlets to stores is a step in this direction.

Redirecting the economy toward man is impossible, I believe, without radically restructuring the structure of foreign economic ties. This topic requires special analysis. However, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the import and export system should also be restructured on the basis of the most immediate social needs and priorities.

The social conversion of the economy is not a spontaneous process but a controllable one. The very great force of inertia must be overcome in order to redirect the vast weighty economy toward man and ensure that the direct satisfaction of his needs is a priority. That is why it is important to clearly define the levers for conversion and utilize them in a skillful fashion. **Strategic initiative and the organizational and decisionmaking role have, of course been given to the soviets, to which not only complete political but also complete economic power is being transferred.** Every deputy is responsible to his voters and wins their trust via his program, in which priority is given to social questions, and is required to justify this trust. The most fundamental significance of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies is that henceforth the soviets and their plenipotentiary permanent bodies are indeed the leading force in practice, capable

of overcoming the departments' monopoly and the collective egoism of enterprises, associations, and cooperatives, and of taking charge of the structural restructuring of the economy in the interests of the people.

The market, which requires a flexible reaction from commodity producers to the needs and demand of consumers and the ability to rapidly plug the commodity gaps that may emerge, is the mighty motive force of conversion. The emergent regional economic accountability, whose main purpose is to gear all local economic capacities to meeting the population's vital needs, prompts this.

Nor must the role of the center in the social conversion of the economy be underestimated. As they concentrate at their disposal a considerable proportion of the national income and the compensation fund [fond vozmeshcheniya], the USSR Council of Ministers, central economic bodies, ministries, and departments, and the governments of the union republics are required to assume responsibility for a drastic turnaround in structural, investment, and foreign economic policy. We must turn the managerial steering wheel abruptly so as to change the proportions rapidly and in a well-balanced fashion to favor the sectors that directly meet the people's needs. Moreover, this must be done in the plan for 1990 rather than in the next 5-year plan, as delays in saturating the market and resolving long-overdue social and ecological problems are no longer tolerable.

Agricultural

Gorbachev, Ligachev Attend CPSU Food Conference

PM0307095789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1-3

[TASS report: "Conference at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] As already reported, a conference was held at the CPSU Central Committee 30 June, which examined progress in the fulfillment of party and government decisions on developing the base for storage and processing of agricultural produce and machine building for the food industry and for the creation of a modern food industry.

Opening the conference, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said:

We have planned this conference for a long time and regard it as an important phase in the implementation of our great work to implement the major decisions adopted on questions of developing the agricultural produce storage and processing base and food-industry machine building.

We regard this as a paramount and urgent task, since the output currently produced by the country's agrarian sector could—given proper storage and transportation and careful processing—meet people's needs for more and better-quality food. It is nonsense for us to continue to tackle questions of increasing agricultural production alone, without thinking about and showing concern for rational use of all these products.

These are wide-ranging tasks. We have enlisted many sectors, including defense sectors, in resolving them. You are aware of that, and there will be a report on the question presently. I believe that we must have a thorough and specific discussion on these topics and take a look together at the way things are going. We cannot allow weakness, disorganization, and irresponsibility in this area. Our conference's task is to examine all the practical questions linked with the fulfillment of the important decisions adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Government on this problem.

Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report. We want to examine questions from a political viewpoint, he said—from the viewpoint of the responsibility of communists in charge of ministries, departments, republics, krays, oblasts, cities, and enterprises for the fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decisions regarding the creation of a modern food industry in the country over the next few years. The party can boost its prestige in society by resolving the food problem and other vitally important problems. That is one aspect of the question.

Another is the fact that at both central and local level agro-industrial complex management organs are now in the process of radical reorganization while the soviets have still not been vested with the requisite rights and resources. It is important to fortify them with the strength of party influence.

The Central Committee plenum last March confirmed the socialist path of development for the agro-industrial complex and elaborated the party's agrarian policy under contemporary conditions.

This policy is being implemented under difficult conditions. On the one hand, there are favorable factors at work. Above all the fact that agrarian policy is being implemented during a period of restructuring where the national economy is to reach a new qualitative level. It is generally known that the development of the agrarian sector in a country like ours depends in many respects on the potential of the entire economy.

It is also important that society has formed the opinion that the resolution of the food question must be given priority. The appeal from agrarian deputies to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies weighed heavily in this area.

The reduction in military expenditure and the increasingly wide-ranging involvement of the defense industry complex and all the production and intellectual potential

of the country's cities in the problems of the agro-industrial complex will, indisputably, help in implementing the agrarian policy.

However, there are also factors at work that are complicating the implementation of the agrarian policy. First, the unchecked increase in the money supply added to the acute shortage of goods and services considerably heightens the population's demand for a variety of food products and intensifies the pressure on the food counter, and there are increasing contradictions within the economy. Second, hitherto unprecedented relative increases in agricultural production and capital investments have been established for the 13th 5-Year Plan. See for yourselves. In the 13th 5-Year Plan there is to be a 26- to 30-percent increase in the production of food goods, while an increase of only 19 percent is envisaged in capital investments in the agro-industrial complex.

The acuteness of the country's food supply problem can only be alleviated and then eliminated—and what is more, within a short timeframe—by mobilizing all resources and above all by substantially reducing losses of agricultural produce during production, storage, processing, transportation, and marketing. That is the root of the question under discussion, Ye.K. Ligachev said.

Our country underestimated these questions for many years, sidestepping them, as it were. We devoted all our attention to one thing alone for a long time: increasing the grain and vegetable harvest and obtaining more milk and meat.

The waste of this wealth used to reach 20 percent or even more. Specialists have calculated that the country loses approximately 1 million tonnes of meat owing to the shortage of meat processing capacities and the lack of cold storage facilities. Just think, there is a meat shortage and the country is wasting a whole 1 million tonnes of it!

M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his closing speech at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies that all efforts to increase agricultural output are simply pointless if questions concerning the accelerated development of the storage and processing base are not resolved.

We have delayed considerably mastering these new approaches in the sphere of agrarian policy.

The state of the processing industry and its profound lag reveal particularly graphically how confined the country's agro-industrial complex is within the iron grip of imbalance. The fixed production capital growth rates were 50-100 percent higher in the countryside than in processing sectors. Many food production units in the country have reached a critical state. For instance, approximately 40 percent of enterprises producing sausage are in a state of breakdown. Two-thirds of the technical equipment is obsolete, physically worn out, and in need of replacement.

The underdevelopment of the national processing, storage, and, marketing base is indicated by the fact that, for instance, this sphere of agro-industrial production's share in the value of the agro-industrial complex's end product is 70-80 percent in many foreign countries, while in our country it is less than 40 percent. A fundamental difference, which is clearly not to our advantage.

I'm repeating myself, but I emphasize nevertheless that this became possible, that people got away with this in the past because the operating efficiency of the agro-industrial complex was not assessed by the presence of food products in the stores, that is in terms of real concern for people, but was determined by the percentage increase in the gross harvest, numbers of livestock, and so on. We cannot work like that now.

During this 5-year plan we have mapped out a plan for the priority development of this sphere. Investment policy and the structure for capital investments for the entire 5-year plan and the subsequent period have been amended. Considerable funds—R77 billion—have been channeled into developing the agricultural storage and processing base in the years 1988-1995.

The report analyzed the action taken to implement the program mapped out. The volume of commodity output in food and processing sectors of the agro-industral complex rose by R21 billion, or almost 15 percent in 1988 in comparison with 1985—although that is, of course, still not enough.

A great deal is being done in this area in Belgorod Oblast, and work has been mobilized in Bryansk Oblast. Party, soviet, and economic organs in the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR], Stavropol Kray, Brest, Lipetsk, Omsk, Orel, and Saratov Oblasts, and the Lithuanian and Georgian union republics are making a substantial contribution to developing the material-technical base of the food industry.

Thus, there are definite improvements in the resolution of this task. All the same the progress made in fulfilling the party and government resolutions arouses serious concern. In many areas there is talk of priorities, while the results speak of failure and stagnation. This is, strictly speaking, what made this meeting necessary.

Dwelling on the results of capital construction, the main speaker noted that R1.5 billions' worth of capital investments had failed to be utilized at food industry installations in the first 3 years of the 5-year plan. A serious backlog had been allowed to occur in Chita, Chernovitsy, and Uralsk Oblasts, the North Osetian ASSR, and the Uzbek and Kirgniz union republics. The situation in the Moldavian SSR is particularly unfortunate.

It should be said that construction ministries, particularly the Ministry of Construction in the Eastern Regions of the USSR, the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas

Industry Enterprises, the Ministry of Construction in the Northern and Western Regions of the USSR, and the Ministry of Construction in the Southern Regions of the USSR, have not changed their attitude on the whole to the construction of storage and processing facilities. Construction subunits of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] agroindustrial committees constantly allow backlogs to occur. For example, work at the Krymskiy cannery in Krasnodar Kray is running into its 16th year and at the Uyarskiy meat combine in Krasnoyarsk Kray its 13th. There are construction schedule overruns in Leningrad, Perm, and Kemerovo Oblast, Altay Kray, and the Mordovian ASSR.

What kind of scientific and technical progress can one speak of after the commissioning of food production units when their designs are 20 years old?

The commissioning of enterprises in a truncated form, that is to say without solving the social questions, is still being practiced. As a result the national economy has for a long time failed to obtain the appropriate return from them. The example of Rostov Oblast's Azovskiy baby-food combine, whose capacities are being assimilated too slowly, has been cited. What is holding it up? The Ministry of Construction in the Southern Regions of the USSR, the RSFSR Gosagroprom [State Agro-industrial Committee], and the Rostov Oblast Soviet Executive Committee have failed to ensure the construction of the combine as an integrated package. Only 70 percent of the planned accommodation for the collective has been commissioned. The approach to the selection of the enterprise leadership has been superficial.

In this regard the speaker noted that, while withdrawing from operational economic questions, party committees should in no way withdraw from cadre policy. It is through communists and cadre policy that the party primarily exercises its leading role in society. Questions of leaders do, of course, have to be tackled on a democratic basis.

Local organs in a number of regions are holding up the location and construction of enterprises which are to produce output not just for local consumption but for union and republic stocks. The party central committee roundly condemns such antistate practice and deems intolerable all manifestations of localism and parasitism. Such a stance has nothing in common with the federative structure of the country and the integrated national economic complex. At the same time there is sense in paying heed to suggestions from local level and leaving some increase in output in the hands of republics, krays, and oblasts by way of incentive.

The country's processing industry has become concentrated predominantly in cities and has in the main taken the form of major enterprises. The USSR, for example, has around 900 meat-processing enterprises, while the United Staes has almost 4,000. While not abandoning the construction of major and medium-sized enterprises it is essential to expand the number of small-capacity processing plants, particularly of modular design, and to locate them as close as possible to the areas of raw materials, that is to say, build them actually on collective farms [kolkhoz] and state farms [sovkhoz] and in rayon centers.

Ye.K. Ligachev noted the need to place special stress at today's conference on our policy regarding machine building for the food industry. In the last 3 years R2.3 billions' worth of foreign currency have been spent to this end. We will naturally continue to purchase the best, but this should become the exception rather than the rule. The country possesses enough brainpower and material and technical resources to raise our own food machine building to world technical standards within the set period, as we all had the opportunity to see for ourselves at the exhibition organized at the All-Union Exhibition of National Economic Achievements. I repeat, to world technical standards, otherwise retooling is pointless.

The greatest responsibility for solving this task resides with the defense sectors of industry. By 1995 they have to increase output of modern equipment for food industry enterprises to R17.5 billion. During this period more than 3,000 items of equipment have to be put into series production.

In short, the work being done is gigantic and very encouraging.

A number of defense sectors are characterized by a systematic and planned approach to solving their set task. The USSR Ministry of General Machine Building, where councils of chief specialists and equipment developers have been set up and businesslike ties established with agroindustrial complex specialists, offer an example of this. Work in the USSR Ministry of Medium Machine Building is well established. Five design-technology centers have been set up in this ministry, which has been set the task of producing milk-processing equipment.

However, work has not yet been set up in this way everywhere. While fulfilling the plan for equipment manufacture overall in 1988, the defense sectors as a whole did not meet it in terms of product mix. Serious criticism is being leveled at the USSR Ministry of the Defense Industry.

But many kinds of series-produced equipment manufactured by the defense complex are given extremely high prices which are out of keeping with the increase in their technical standards and operational characteristics. Of course, we have to pay a higher price for equipment which meets modern technical standards, is highly productive and reliable, and uses progressive materials and microprocessors. But this question must be tackled in each specific case by the customer and producer in a

sensible rather than perfunctory manner, on the basis of mutual advantage. However, the USSR State Committee for Prices should not stand aloof here.

It is clear from this analysis that the leaders of all defense complex ministries have not been equally responsible and party-minded in their approach to fulfilling the party Central Committee and government decisions on creating a modern food industry in the country. We are not talking about some kind of patronage or so-called sponsorship. This is now state policy, the work is incorporated within the plan, and the conversion of defense enterprises is under way.

We believe that the ministries will draw the requisite conclusions from the criticism. It is in general a time now when it is important to inculcate in defense industry collectives a respect for output intended for citizens at large and the production of high-quality consumer goods.

Efforts to retool the enterprises of the food industry and the ministry of civil machine building are building up too slowly. It has been noted, in particular, that there is a shortage of electric motors, particularly small-capacity motors (Ministry of the Electronics Industry) and that the agroindustrial complex' specialized transport needs are not being met (Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building). The weakest, most vulnerable question in the whole program of machine building for the food industry and one which has not been thoroughly thought through is refrigeration equipment. The USSR State Planning Committee and the the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building now have to make their contribution here.

These examples show that the machine building ministries and their leaders have not really expanded and are working at the old level in supplying food enterprises with equipment.

It must be noted that many cities sometimes do not wait for centralized supplies of food equipment but instead undertake production on their own initiative. The exhibitions organized this year within the framework of the zonal conferences conducted by the CPSU Central Committee have presented a remarkable picture of enthusiasm and real technical creativity on the part of specialists and workers and of the art of skilled craftsmen from among the people. Everything was on display there: from home-built minitractors to original kitchen equipment. Experience has been gained in that regard in the cities of Kharkov, Belgorod, and Kaluga, as well as in Penza, Volgograd, and Kalinin Oblasts.

It would be good to organize the production of such equipment in all oblasts, krays, and republics using industrial enterprises including the agro-industrial committee for that purpose. This will make it possible to create consumer cooperative production and procurement centers in large villages and rayon centers to produce meat products for the rural and urban population by purchasing livestock and poultry from personal plots. Then the country's consumer cooperative system will rapidly become a production one, too. But most important of all, this will also improve the population's food supply.

In any event, all this is good work. Let specialized state enterprises work according to the food machine building program. But let there also be scope and support for local technical initiative. To some extent this will weaken the monopoly of sectoral machine building, but it could perhaps also provide it with competition.

The speaker drew attention to another problem. There has long been an incorrect attitude to the production of wrapping and packing materials in the country. That is still true today. Output losses are not being reduced. Over R300 million in foreign currency have been spent on buying wrapping and packing resources in the current 5-year plan.

The old approaches are still evident in the attitudes of chemical and timber industry ministry personnel: The food industry is not the most important thing in our lives, they say, much less packaging. The state target need not be met. And it is not met, thus harming the interests of millions of people.

Therefore, despite the improvements—and they really exist—there has been no breakthrough yet in the planned fundamental renewal of the country's food industry. No other conclusion is possible here.

Party committees and soviet and economic organs both centrally and locally should thoroughly examine progress in the fulfillment of CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions, investigate each project individually, and determinedly rectify the situation. There must be efficient and coordinated work by all ministries and departments of the USSR and union republic Councils of Ministers on questions of retooling the agro-industrial complex's processing sectors. There must also be a coordination of efforts on the part of standing organs of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Each republic, kray, oblast, city, and rayon must have a comprehensive plan for the retooling of food industry enterprises and the development of the food storage and trade base and must focus the resources available in cities on its fulfillment. Much is being done in this respect by labor collectives in cities in Tyumen, Rostov, Dnepropetrovsk, Ryazan, Voronezh, Gorkiy, and Minsk oblasts, in Krasnoyarsk and Krasnodar Krays, and in Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan.

But the list of oblasts where not enough is being done would be even longer. The country has thousands of rayon centers and cities where the so-called rayon food combine, the bakery, or the meat combine is the most

poverty-stricken enterprise. There you have it—the most typical manifestation of the old approaches and the old thinking in the solution of the urgent questions of people's daily lives.

Building a new enterprise and providing it with new equipment is very important. But the main thing, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, is to quickly assimilate capacities and guarantee the production of a wide variety of high-quality food products. Here it is necessary to combine modern technology with the improvement of economic relations and to create a system for training and improving the skills of cadres who are learning new economic methods. This should also include secondment for cadres to the best enterprises in the country and abroad. True economic accountability, the lease, the cooperative system, and modern cadres are the most important components of the program for retooling the food industry. This is also necessary for the efficient use of the production potential existing in the food industry.

We must look at how each specific meat combine, dairy plant, bakery, confectionery factory, fish combine, and other food enterprises are working. The most important thing is to establish a closer link between man and the means of production, to lease the means of production to labor collectives on a broader scale, to create state-lease-cooperative associations, to introduce economic accountability universally and on that basis to tap the potential latent in the free labor worker and in socialist ownership.

It is necessary to move more boldly toward new forms of production organization and broad cooperation among food enterprises, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes as well as storage and sales bases and trade on the basis of economic accountability, contract, and lease relations. These may be agricultural combines, agricultural firms, cooperatives, or associations. There are quite a few examples of this kind already.

There are 3 million people employed in the country's food industry. Last year the total volume of output which they produced amounted to R141 billion. Furthermore, this is output truly in daily demand—which greatly determines the Soviet people's capacity for work, their health, and their mood.

Hence the conclusion that it is necessary to comprehensively enhance the prestige of work in processing industry enterprises and the standing of the profession of food industry worker. Yet this used to be the most respected work employing members of families from generation to generation. It would be splendid if the people felt that one city had the reputation for producing the best sausages, another the best bread, or that the best confectionery came from a certain producer. I have no doubt that this will come, it has to come.

The Central Committees of union republic Communist Parties, and party kray and oblast committees undoubtedly have a duty to pay greater attention to party organizations at food industry enterprises. These organizations, as a rule, have small numbers of workers, unlike large plants, and even rayon committee personnel do not always know where they are. It is necessary to help the party organizations of this very important sector to restructure their work in the spirit of modern requirements and to enhance the responsibility of communists for their production assignments.

This is largely a transitional period now. Without supplanting soviet or economic organs, party committees must ensure the practical implementation of the party's agrarian policy and do so primarily via the communists. The party's prestige is now determined largely by how economic and social problems are resolved.

Of course, we must strengthen soviets at all levels in every possible way and help them to become full masters of their territories more quickly, including in food supplies to the population. Trade union and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations should be more closely involved in these vitally important issues.

We consider that all the mass media should be more fully involved in publicizing the process of the food industry's development. We need literally nationwide control in this area. We hope that journalists will be interested in this problem. We should not concentrate on identical issues. The agrarian sector of the economy includes agricultural production, the processing and food industries, special machine building, capital construction, the social sphere in the countryside, and millions of workers, kolkhoz members, leaseholders, and specialists. And the task of the party and its leading organs is not to teach peasants how to plow and sow (which has already happened, with well-known consequences) but to develop and implement agrarian policy, determine its priorities, and take account of and implement the interests of society and the peasant. The entire range of problems should be reflected in the mass media.

During the period of preparations for the March Plenum, at the plenum itself, and at the conferences held by the CPSU Central Committee questions of improving production relations in the countryside, developing kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and family farms, and expanding economic ties between industrial and agricultural enterprises were discussed. Nobody should get the impression that we are somehow pushing agriculture into the background by examining the problems of the processing industry today. On the contrary—we are providing scope for the further development of agricultural production.

The creation of a highly developed and modern food industry is one of the quickest ways of increasing food resources in the country. And we are sure that kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and family farms will produce substantial additional returns.

As you know, the zonal conferences held by the CPSU Central Committee this year examined questions of economic transformations on kolkhozes and sovkhozes on the basis of the introduction of intrafarm leasehold relations and the comprehensive development of personal plots. There are 36 million such family farms in the country, and they produce 24 percent of all agricultural produce. It is now important to give them large-scale equipment.

Interesting ideas have recently been put forward, not least by economists, on ways of overcoming tension in the national economy. Admittedly, other voices have been heard too. As is well known, the country is experiencing many shortages. But, regrettably, there is no shortage of strongly expressed views, labels, and plain slander. Some people are forecasting a famine in this country in a year or two. In order to prevent such a famine they propose breaking up kolkhozes and sovkhozes, giving the land to the peasants, denationalizing the land, and then denationalizing all means of production. In real life it turns out that the overwhelming majority of peasants do not want to take the land and leave kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Then people start accusing them of being lazy and unaccustomed to hard work.

What is the actual situation? The Soviet peasantry, despite massive repressions, supplied the country with food during the most difficult years, took up arms together with the working class and the intelligentsia to defend the gains of socialism and the motherland's honor and freedom, and made an enormous contribution to the creation of the country's industrial might. Kolkhoz and sovkhoz working people continue to increase food production at a time of shortages of material, technical, and financial resources and major disorganization of their daily lives, although it is well known that our peasants are four times worse off for farming equipment than U.S. farmers.

Under these complex conditions the Communist Party has undertaken the historic responsibility of resolving the food problem. All party detachments and the Central Committee are being set a political examination by the people. There is no time to waste.

The debate was opened by A.V. Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers. The republic, he said, has brought about a major turnaround in its investment and structural policy in favor of the accelerated buildup of processing sector and storage base capacities. However, the proper results in this have not yet been achieved. The situation is particularly unfavorable in the Siberian and Far East regions and in the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem Zone.

The fact that enterprises are underequipped and operate to low technical standards and poor quality is a substantive factor restraining the development of processing sectors.

The speech noted that, with enterprises' transition to economic accountability and self-financing, the question of improving the pricing and economic normatives mechanism has become particularly acute. The thesis was advanced that it is expedient to establish preferential normatives for deductions and payments to the budget at a level ensuring the retooling of processing sectors through enterprise funds.

G.I. Revenko, first secretary of Kiev party oblast committee [obkom], took the rostrum. He called the state of processing sectors in his region simply critical and cited the following figures: Production of foodstuffs in the current 5-year plan in the oblast has increased by 14.4 percent, and the volume of the production of the main types of agricultural output has increased considerably faster and has surpassed the growth in processing capacities—the shortage of which currently amounts to, for instance, 101 tonnes of meat per shift and almost 1,000 tonnes of milk per shift.

In the main processing sectors equipment is to a considerable extent obsolete and worn out; consequently, manual labor is used everywhere, which means that these sectors lack prestige.

It should not be said that we have not reacted to the acuteness of the prevailing situation, the speaker stated. In the past 3 years more capital investment has been put into developing the food, sugar, meat, and dairy industries and into processing enterprises in the consumer cooperative system than in the entire previous 5-year plan. The program elaborated in the oblast for developing the agro-industrial complex requires R2 billion to expand processing. It is all a question of resources. We also need a well-conceived and scientifically substantiated concept for developing the processing industry—a concept that rules out subjectivism and shortcomings and takes account of the entire range of questions, including the most trivial questions. Processing has now become just as much of a priority as social issues. If we do not all tackle it we will not achieve what we now want to achieve. It is a party task, a very human and noble task.

V.F. Kryuchkov, general director of the "Krymskiy" Agricultural Combine in Krasnodar Kray, noted that in the past 3 years more than R500 million has been channeled into new construction and modernization in the kray, and additional production capacity has been introduced. However, the state of affairs in the processing industry has by no means reached the point where the whole biological harvest is utilized.

Going on to discuss the problems of his own enterprise, he stated with alarm that the pea crop is currently dying as a result of a shortage of modern facilities. The modernization that has been carried out has had no effect in practice. Holdups—breakdowns, stoppages—occur as a result of low machinery productivity. Repeated appeals to the State Agro-industrial Committee [Gosagroprom] for equipment to be replaced or for at

least some new machines be delivered have received the same answer: "Not possible." At the same time, the speaker pointed out, Western firms are prepared to supply any technological equipment immediately. But how long can we keep going abroad with outstretched hands? Our scientists and developers should finally make their contribution.

The agricultural combine leader expressed concern over the current procedure for regulating external commercial activities, in which you can wade through some 50 instructions and still obtain no results.

You can talk as much as you like about solving the food problem, V.V. Grigoryev, first secretary of Vitebsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom, said, but all this talk won't be worth a penny without a modern base for the storage and processing of agricultural produce. Major resources are needed to create such a base, the speaker emphasized. In our oblast we decided first of all to attract industrial enterprises' resources, we conducted detailed explanatory work among labor collectives, and we convinced people that this is the only correct path in today's conditions.

The speaker made the following proposal: to set up in the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], under the direct leadership of their chairmen, integrated main administrations for the provision of materials and for the supply of equipment to food industry projects under construction. There must be utmost encouragement and stimulation of imaginative and above-plan projects through the efficient allocation of the material, technical, and financial resources they need. This sector deserves to be approached with the highest possible degree of responsibility and to be given total priority.

In our republic, A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, declared that we have invested over R190 million to develop the processing sectors' base over the last 3 years. Resources were mainly channeled into the reconstruction and retooling of enterprises.

But we have not managed to fulfill the set tasks regarding the processing sectors' development. Cadres are short of persistence and even competence. The solution of a series of questions depends on the appropriate organs. The work on project completion and the deliveries of equipment and various materials is unsatisfactory. This holds back both the construction and the commissioning of projects.

The speaker went on to list the types of equipment which the republic's processing sectors find in especially short supply. Many orders for such equipment remain systematically unfulfilled.

It must be openly admitted, I.A. Rogov, rector of the Moscow Applied Biotechnology Institute, noted, that the criticism contained in the report applies also to us, because our graduates and postgraduate students have failed to speak up promptly in defense of new technologies.

The state of VUZ's [higher educational institutions] training specialists for the processing sectors demands intervention. The state of the sector was described as unsatisfactory, and the state of the sector science in general is almost as bad.

This is attributable, first, to enterprises' and organizations' total lack of interest in the carrying out of fundamental work; second, to the lack of highly skilled specialists in the spheres of molecular biology and computer science, in other words the sectors which determine the profile of scientific and technical progress; and third, to the fact that we missed an avenue which is now undergoing headlong development in the West—food chemistry, which has gained a leadership position in some 15-20 years.

Analyzing the situation as regards food supplies in the oblast, G.M. Khodyrev, first secretary of Gorkiy CPSU Obkom, described it as complex and said that work on the development of processing sectors' material and technical base is far from adequate. The production and scientific-technical potential of Gorkiy and other industrial centers in the oblast is now involved in helping the agro-industrial complex. Nonetheless, the speaker said, the situation remains difficult. There is a lack of confidence that the set targets will be attained without attracting additional financial, material, and technical resources. We could have taken advantage of the recommendation to transfer to the agrarian complex up to 10 percent of state capital investments allocated to industrial enterprises. But many ministries either prohibit their enterprises from doing this, or cut down the amounts to a miserly size, or transfer only money, forgetting that the agrarian complex needs not only cash but mainly contract work quotas and material resources.

The time has probably come, while applying the new economic management system, to finally resolve the questions of price formation. A paradoxical situation develops in some sectors due to wholesale price anomalies: The more the output produced, the greater the losses borne by the processing industry. These questions must be settled on a countrywide scale. Party committees and ideological institutions must give more attention to food industry collectives.

V.A. Masol, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, took the floor. He also named the shortage of technological equipment and its poor quality as the prime cause holding back the development of processing sectors, and cited relevant

statistical data reflecting the volumes of various item categories delivered to the republic. At this rate, the speaker noted, it will take 40 years to reequip the sugar industry, for example.

M.S. Gorbachev. I received a letter from Krasnodar. The secretary of the Uspenka sugar plant party organization wrote that he visited an exhibition and saw nothing for the sugar industry there. And yet all the sugar refineries need modernizing.

V.A. Masol. Of course, we have not given up. The production potential of cities and industrial centers is getting involved. We have organized the manufacture by the republic's enterprises of some of the equipment that is in short supply.

V.Ye. Shestakov, director of the Biysk meat canning combine, reported in his speech that, in terms of livestock procurement volumes, Altay Kray occupies a leading position in the RSFSR. At the same time, the processing capacities were designed to cope with just one-half of this volume. This is why it becomes necessary to transport livestock to other regions, and this leads to a loss of output.

I.K. Dzhurabekov, deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's Gosagroprom, drew attention to the fact that Uzbekistan is still facing the serious problem of storage facility shortages.

It is planned to alleviate this urgent problem by 1993. But the implementation of this task is being held back by the inadequate supplies of refrigeration compressor equipment. Machine building enterprises do not produce sufficient quantities, while the USSR Gossnab is not persistent enough in meeting the needs. In this context, the speaker raised the question of having a single countrywide coordinator of the production and delivery of equipment for the processing sectors.

I would like, first and foremost, to accept as valid the complaints, remarks, and requests addressed to the defense industry complex from this rostrum, I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, said. In addition to great alarm caused by the state of affairs in the agro-industrial complex processing sectors, he expressed total confidence that the defense industry sectors are capable of solving within a relatively brief time period the questions associated with providing support for the processing of agricultural produce.

Are we satisfied with the work that has been done and the current state of affairs? Let me answer unambiguously that we are not satisfied. Mainly because the standards and quantity of equipment delivered in 1988 fell immeasurably short of equipment requirements. The speaker cited a series of specific examples to substantiate this conclusion.

It would be correct to concentrate in just one set of hands the questions of both planning and manufacturing equipment and technology. It is incumbent on every plant in every oblast and every republic to supply component articles in the quantity required to meet the set production volumes. And if some additional decision proves necessary through the Council of Ministers, we will also look into that matter.

Critically evaluating the work that has been done, A.N. Shchepetilnikov, minister of construction in the southern regions of the USSR, said, it must be noted that not all plans have been successfully fulfilled. The commissioning deadlines for a number of capacities have been overrun, the fulfillment of construction and installation work plans has not been ensured, and the volume of this work is still increasing only slowly. The speaker named projects scheduled for commissioning in the immediate future and spoke about measures being taken to meet the targets.

According to the speaker, prompt delivery of equipment to projects scheduled for commissioning is needed to ensure that agro-industrial complex capacities are commissioned on schedule. He expressed the wish for equipment to be delivered not in dribs and drabs, but as a single package ready for installation in a plant. The USSR Gosplan must ensure priority for the construction of agro-industrial complex projects by reassigning construction industry organizations from the construction of other sectors' production capacities.

Z.D. Balakireva, director of Moscow Oblast's Zhukovskiy bread combine, spoke of the experience of her enterprise's reconstruction with active participation by the city's other plants and organizations. But by no means all of the bread combine's problems have been resolved.

Addressing those present, the speaker said: "I see that this audience is almost exclusively male; there are just a few women scattered here and there. And yet three-fourths of workers in the processing industry are women. Maybe, had the situation been reversed, the question we are discussing today would have been resolved a long time ago." This, after all, is something that aggravates the sector's already acute social problems. Labor in this sector still has no glamour associated with it.

The audience's attention was also urgently drawn to the rising prices for and persistent shortages of equipment. This is why major difficulties develop when it comes to financing measures for the reconstruction, retooling, and capital repairs of fixed production assets.

V.V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers, took the floor. He said that the main reason for the republic's incomplete assimilation of funds for increasing processing sectors' production

capacities was not so much the fact that contract organizations were overworked, as the delay in concluding contracts for the supply of imported industrial equipment through the fault of foreign trade organs.

The principal factor in the development of the processing sectors, the speaker noted, is not simply increasing capacities, but creating modern production facilities ensuring thorough and comprehensive processing of agricultural raw material. It is very gratifying that work is already being done in this area in the country. But the machine building ministries have been dragging their feet. In view of this the republic is gearing local industrial enterprises and organizations to putting every effort into making certain types of equipment and mechanisms for processing enterprises, which will make it possible to reduce the amount of manual and heavy physical labor.

V.P. Radovskiy, head and chief designer of the USSR Ministry of General Machine Building "Energomash" design bureau, was next to speak. We have been commissioned, he said, to develop special milk separators with a productivity of 25 tonnes an hour. Big cities should have big dairy combines and they must have separators of a corresponding productivity level. World practice suggests that this is the case. At the moment there are three models. In September we intend to switch to tests on milk and then to series production.

One of the tasks involved in the development of this separator is that of making it last twice as long as the stipulated state standard for these articles. I think we will achieve this, the speaker assured the audience. But, clearly, one must not always go for the cheapest option. When creating new equipment for agricultural production one should think first about quality, durability, and guarantees.

G.D. Mgeladze, first deputy chairman of the Georgian Council of Ministers and chairman of the Georgian Gosagroprom, talked about the work being done in the republic to develop the processing industry, stressing that advances in this sector have been very slight.

The speaker devoted considerable attention to leasing problems. The legal foundation is there, but it is still a slow process. The cause of this is the mentality of the peasants, who have been deceived more than once, and the vehement resistance of many farm leaders and specialists and also of the rayon management component. Land must be given to the peasant in perpetuity, he said, with inheritance rights.

For many years, at many meetings—big and small—Astrakhan Oblast has been hailed as the Russian truck garden, I.N. Dyakov, first secretary of Astrakhan CPSU Obkom, said. The concept symbolized the large volumes of production and supplies of tomatoes, melons, and other mainly fresh products. But up to 30 percent of it perishes in situ, and another 10-15 percent, approximately, during transportation. What we must be talking about today is not the reconstruction of the processing sector, but its creation in a new form, the speaker said. He pointed out that many industrial centers have refrigerated stores, but there is nothing to put in them. In the raw material zones you have the opposite picture: The vegetables are there, but there is no immediate accommodation for them.

The question under discussion is a very topical one for our republic, which for many decades has been seen as the raw material base for many sectors of union industry, including the food sector—E.Kh. Gukasov, first deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Agroindustrial Committee, began his speech. He cited estimates to the effect that in 1990, even if the fulfillment of all plans is ensured, the republic will create processing capacities to cover only 40 percent of requirements.

It is true that steps are being taken to change the situation. At the same time, the speaker noted, the strengthening of the material-technical base of the processing sectors is being hampered by inadequate provision of modern equipment. He suggested that contracts for the supply of equipment should be concluded at the fair that has opened at the USSR Exhibition of Economic Achievements and that it should not be confined to ascertaining what is needed.

During the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies great hopes were pinned on the fact that the defense sectors of industry, with their scientific potential, are to assist the introduction of major achievements into the national economy. V.F. Utkin, general designer at the Ministry of General Machine Building "Yuzhnoye" machine building production association, said, There is no doubt, he said, that we are capable of creating units that match and, indeed, exceed world standards.

When talking about conversion, one assumes that chief designers in the main areas are responsible for the finished product. Delivery discipline is no less important. If we cannot knock this into shape, no telegrams are going to help. This question should be seen as a political one. We must apply not only directive documents, but also party conscience in order to rectify matters. There is no other way of creating very intricate processing complexes in a short time.

M.S. Gorbachev summed up the conference. He said:

Comrades! By way of a conclusion I would like first of all to respond from the viewpoint of political principle to today's meeting, to the discussion that has taken place here. I think it has been useful and important, but, to be frank, I am not entirely satisfied. I will tell you why. There was a feeling that not all the comrades are aware of the acute nature of the socioeconomic situation the country is facing.

It is obvious that people's demands are increasing and they are expecting the newly created organs of power, the party, and our cadres to effect a definite change for the better in all spheres of restructuring, above all in the sectors and areas which affect the people's day-to-day needs. I am not going to repeat the discussion that took place at the Congress of People's Deputies. You know it and you know it pretty well, I hope. In that respect today's exchange of opinions on a topic connected with food did not proceed in the way that the current situation demands. After all, basically, comrades, the point is that the country's leadership and our cadres who head sectors and lead republics, krays, oblasts, rayons, and enterprises involved in tackling specific problems of the life of society do not have much time.

People can see that in some cases things are moving along and are changing for the better. This applies to entire sectors, republics, and oblasts. And today's conference confirms this. But the picture over the country is so varied, there is so much persistent inertia, that these islands of vigorous activity are not rescuing the overall situation. The requisite progress has not yet been achieved and in some places there has even been a letup. Today, at the Central Committee, this must be pointed out plainly and in a party-minded manner to the communists who are in charge of crucial areas of work in the country, republics, oblasts, and departments, and at enterprises.

It is clear to us that many questions have to be solved centrally. The chief one is the improvement of the country's financial situation. Without it the people will not feel the positive changes and the extra benefits. We must live within our means and we must pay only money that has been earned.

The next area is that of balancing our market. It is a long job, but there are questions which must be solved in a matter of months, in 12-18 months at the outside. I say this because ways of filling the market with goods are currently being studied. Sectors and union departments are by no means doing all that they might. But their proposals are in most cases close to what is required, what the situation demands. As for republics, krays, and oblasts, some comrades believe that the question of filling the market with goods has to be tackled, but not in their area. But we have a considerable number of sectors, primarily light industry, food industry, and various services, which are all currently under the jurisdiction of local organs.

The decentralization which is taking place in the economy—which has everyone's support and is proceeding from labor collectives, economic leaders, and regional leaders—presupposes not only broader rights and economic independence but also greater responsibility for the realization of those issues whose solution is awaited by our society. This must also be discussed, because many appeals to the center still have a strong element of parasitical attitudes, which have not formed overnight and are deeply rooted in the thinking of our cadres. Everything is now being done with regard to reforming the economy and reforming the political system so that rights are delegated to the local level and decisions are taken at other levels. Not everything has been done, of course. But even now, at this transitional stage, local cadres should take more upon themselves.

That is why I said in my rejoinder that party and soviet bodies in Vitebsk Oblast—which are all using effective methods and possibilities in this transitional period, particularly in their work with cadres and labor collectives—are working "incorrectly." They have determined their fundamental stand and made the measures they have developed into the property of the public and all working people. They have sought out additional resources in order to make progress in resolving food problems. And this is, after all, a comparatively small oblast. We will not embellish the situation—there are many shortcomings in Vitebsk Oblast—but positive trends are in evidence there and results have been achieved.

I could give you many other examples. Wherever enterprising work is in progress, wherever tasks are being set properly, and wherever these tasks are discussed with the people rather than in offices, we can see real progress in improving people's supply and services. All in all, comrades, we have to restructure our work in a cardinal way, determine constructive directions to be taken, and solve urgent problems step by step.

I repeat, the time limit left for resolving urgent issues is, to be frank, not very long. I have been concerned during the discussion by the fact that not everyone is really aware of this. I ask you to think about what I have said. Think about it so that a great deal can be changed in our work and added to it and so that the practical organization of this work can really be developed. That is the first point.

There is more. We took the decision today in the party Central Committee to discuss the question of developing the food industry's base within the context of monitoring decisions taken earlier. At first glance this would appear to be an economic question. No, comrades, we attach political significance to it—a significance it indeed already has. In fact, the food shortage has now created tension in society. The people are rightly asking us to resolve this problem and, what is more, not at some remote point in time but in the near future.

There are measures in this direction that will be implemented over a number of years and will produce results during the next 5-year period or by the start of the 14th 5-year period. They are concerned with thoroughly modernizing production, developing the material and technical base, and so forth. I will not go into all the problems or list all of them.

But, for the present, first of all we have to take urgent steps which must produce results in the near future.

I will begin by saying that one paramount task is to give people a broad opportunity to work and show independence and initiative by reforming economic relations in rural areas. This must be done so as to open the way to using all forms of economic management applicable to the conditions of each region and each economic unit and on the basis of traditions and the state of the economy.

In the one instance it will be an established, efficient kolkhoz [collective farm] which has long been using economic accountability and new technology. In the other instance it will be a firm. A representative of these new forms from the Kuban has spoken here. Others could also share their experience: They are now working in all republics and producing good results. These interesting, effective forms of economic management, which combine production, transportation, storage, processing, sale of output, and even banking matters, must be promoted.

We must reveal the potential of socioeconomic units and utilize the potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes [state farm]. This can be done on the basis of economic accountability, the contract, and the lease system. There has been progress everywhere in this respect to varying degrees. But there are also obstacles. The most typical is the reluctance of economic leaders and specialists to aid the development of new forms and give people an opportunity to develop their initiative. They are afraid of the lease system, they are afraid of the idea of contracts, and they are afraid of the responsibility and hard work they will have to take upon themselves. Wherever they do not succeed in frightening people off, they draw up the kind of lease conditions to deliberately put off any would-be lessor.

Our lease legislation covers virtually everything, but it does not tell us how to break this resistance in economic terms. There are two points here. We must ensure that, as for everyone else, the wages of economic workers and specialists are based on the end result. This was stated at the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum and must be done. Then everything will fall into place and everyone will have an interest in increasing output and improving output quality.

I would like to emphasize that it is right to raise the issue of land being placed at the disposal of Soviet power. In that case, anyone wishing to lease land and not finding support for that wish could turn to the organs of Soviet power for a final decision on this question. If we do not do this and do not break this irregular attitude to the lease system and new forms of economic management, we will not be able to restructure economic relations in rural areas. Of course, all this requires different techniques and different mechanisms. These questions must be considered and more effectively resolved.

Utilizing the potential of family and personal plots everywhere is one measure that can and must give us greater food resources. This is the shortest path, comrades. The experience of Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and the Baltic republics tells us this. These regions have met the population halfway and created the kind of conditions for increasing the number of livestock in the individual sector and providing it with feed. All this rapidly increases food stocks. An understanding attitude is taken to personal plots in Omsk Oblast. We have discussed this more than once. This oblast has one of the highest proportions of livestock in peasant holdings. And all this is integrated with the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, complements other forms well, and makes it possible to make better use of the countryside's overall potential. All this is justified economically and politically.

Personal plots must be supported and developed in every region of the country. I think that even in the Kuban, with its rich black earth, land should be given to people—crop rotational land included. A village resident would like to have a hectare for his personal subsidiary plot? By all means let him have use of it. Perhaps the situation is somewhat different with irrigated land. Here every one-hundredth of a hectare counts. But sectors available for lease can be found even with this type of land. Or take Kazakhstan, for example. There the lease system extends to the steppe regions and the shepherds are satisfied. Some deputies just came back from these regions and talked to me about this the day before yesterday. We have now formulated a common political approach: to give people the opportunity to develop their own personal plots. We must also proceed from this in practical work.

Finally, a quick, effective way to rapidly obtain results in the form of output quantity and quality is to place processing, storage, transportation, and sale on a modern footing. People have pointed out in their speeches today that even well-organized farms and agrarian combines lose as much as 20 percent of their output. With comparatively small effort and material expenditure connected with the production of packaging and the improvement of transportation, Astrakhan Oblast could supply Moscow with as much as an extra 100,000 tonnes of vegetables. The capital has enormous potential so that, working together with the oblasts and republics, these problems could be resolved in the interests of Muscovites themselves.

Analyzing the implementation of resolutions to develop the processing sphere, we note what I would call feeble work both at the center and at the local level.

Why at the center? Because Gosplan, for example, has failed to allocate many resources, particularly to those who have forged ahead in the assimilation of their capital investments. Ministries are slow to develop and assimilate new, mass produced equipment, have failed to resolve many questions of quality, in a number of cases are continuing to produce outmoded equipment, and have set

unwarrantedly high prices for products for the agro-industrial complex. This is no good. This kind of attitude cannot be described as turning toward the agrarian sector. This must be seriously rectified at union level.

On the other hand, enterprises which meet orders for the food industry are not located just anywhere but in specific cities, oblasts, and republics. The latter have their own party organizations and soviet bodies but, we will be frank, they are not very concerned with these enterprises. There is no real organizational work and no ideological backup. This is not the kind of work that should be done at the local level. It is not what is required by restructuring and by the real situation with regard to supplying people with food across the country.

This is why plans and orders concerned with solving the food problem often take a back seat in production collectives rather than being brought to the forefront. I am not blaming the working class here. These are shortcomings of our cadres. This is not how things must now be done. Intensive work is needed to implement everything we have planned. We must concentrate on practical solutions to the questions posed by life.

That is why I would like the results of this conference to be used by the standing bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministries and departments, and our communists who are in charge of them to take real stock of the state of affairs and implement decisions made on the basis of the criticism voiced here. What is now being done must be assessed not by growth percentages but by the extent to which this satisfies our requirements. Then there will be a different scale of thought and a different scale of approach both in Gosplan and in the standing bodies of the Council of Ministers. I think this discussion is useful from the point of view of getting the center to sharply change direction and pay greater attention to resolving the tasks set.

I also see the point of this discussion as being to ensure that, on your return home, you comrades who have taken part in the conference will create the mechanisms to constantly monitor the way in which the decisions are implemented—decisions which concern the most serious aspects of social policy.

I am fully confident that we can change the situation. Wherever progress is lacking, wherever cadres fail to respond to the requirements of restructuring and are deaf to the needs of the people, this question should be raised at party level and an appropriate cadre policy implemented that will ensure the solution of practical tasks.

This applies to cadres at any level. In this respect party bodies have no reason to feel constrained if communists who are [economic] leaders make a mess of things. Because they damage the task in hand itself and the party's prestige.

I would like to wish you all, comrades, real, active, militant work, efficiency, and success.

Commentary on Work of Conference

LD3006190789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Studio commentary by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] A conference on matters relating to the reconstruction of branches of the agro-industrial complex has just completed its work in the CPSU Central Committee. Our commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy was there. Now he is in the studio, so over to him.

[Ruvinskiy] Yes, you know the cross section of participants at this conference was very representative: members of the Politburo of our party; many members of the government; first secretaries of oblast party committees; heads of the agro-industrial sector; heads of local soviet bodies; scientists; representatives from many enterprises; design engineers; and many of our people's deputies and representatives of the agro-industrial complex. In all, I should say there were no fewer than 1,000 people at that conference.

An analysis was conducted of how our food complex is being reequipped technologically. The conference was opened by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and then a report was delivered by Comrade Ligachev. He said that this matter will be examined from the political point of view, from the point of view of the responsibility of communists and leaders. And he described the situation in which the decisions of the March plenum of the CPSU Central Committee are being implemented. In the first place, these decisions are being carried through under the conditions of restructuring, of course, and that is very important; also under the conditions of a reduction in military expenditure and the involvement of the military complex and the military potential of towns in tackling the food issue. At the same time, while there is a lack of goods there is an increase in the pool of money, which of course is boosting the demand for provisions. Additional material resources are required for normal operations.

So what is going on in the country at the moment? We are still losing 1 million tonnes of meat annually due to the absence of processing facilities.

The same goes for milk: I should tell you that as a country we have one quarter—24 percent—of the world output of milk, but that is not enough. There are enormous losses in the processing of sugar beet, vegetables, and sunflowers. Many food-processing facilities have been brought to a critical state. Nevertheless, there has been a slight upturn in the work, particularly since our defense industries have been involved in it. This has been noticeably the case in, for example, Belgorod and Bryansk oblasts, Stavropol Kray, Omsk and Orel oblasts.

But stagnation is still to be found in many places—in Moldavia, for example, there has even been a reduction in the potential of the processing industries. Potatoes, for example, are hardly processed at all in this country: We process rougly ½ of 1 percent of our potatoes, whereas in the United States, for example, one third of the potatoes grown are processed. These are figures from Comrade Ligachev's report.

[Presenter] Thank you. That is all very interesting, but I have perhaps a rather unexpected question: As someone who was at this conference, what were your personal impressions?

[Ruvinskiy] Personal impressions? Well, you know, as I was listening to that report what struck me most was that not once in the whole of the report did I hear the word leasing. And I would say that surprised many other participants in the conference. But then many other people spoke subsequently: the debate was opened by Comrade Vlasov, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, and many other comrades spoke. But you know, by and large, they still focused their attention on purely economic issues. Of course, these are very important, but still they are economic and not political.

Then Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev rounded the proceedings off. He remarked that he was not totally satisfied with the discussion that had taken place. The situation in the country is much more acute; people expected definite changes for the better—his words. The country's leadership and the top personnel in the provinces now have little credit in hand.

Matters are proceeding in quite disparate ways in the provinces, but by and large there is no real progress. What is now needed, above all, is financial improvement, but as yet attitudes of dependence remain very strong in the provinces. True, there are instances of initiative being shown: In particular Mikhail Sergeyevich singled out Vitebsk oblast as an example of a good approach toward tackling the food problem. Radical restructuring in work is needed throughout—from the Supreme Soviet to each oblast—and the question of foodstuffs, of the shortage of foodstuffs, is primarily a political matter, remarked Mikhail Sergeyevich. All forms of farming must be utilized: kolkhozes, sovkhozes, agrofirms, agrocombines, leasing, family market gardens, and everything else. But there is a reluctance on the part of several top economic leaders to help the new forms along, said Mikhail Sergeyevich. These economic leaders must be placed in a situation whereby their salaries depend ultimately on the quantity of food produced, while the land must be at the disposal of the local soviets, of soviet power. Family-based farms need more attention paid to them, since their potential is as yet nowhere nearly fully utilized, and that is the shortest way. People must be given the land, said Mikhail Sergeyevich. Then he dwelled in detail on the work of the enterprises working on our food program and on the tasks of the party bodies. He noted that the Council of Ministers and Gosplan [State Planning Committee] have painstaking work yet to do on the outcome of the conference.

Colorado Beetle Rife in Kursk Oblast

PM0507105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[PRAVDA correspondent N. Utkin report under the rubric "Question": "Take That, Beetle!"]

[Excerpt] The 2d 10-day period in June began with telephone calls to PRAVDA's office in Kursk on this topic: Potato crops are being attacked by the Colorado beetle, and there is no means of combating it. The telephone calls have not stopped even now. "Tell me who to turn to," Z. Krestyaninova's voice came over the telephone from 22, Gazoprovodskaya Street. "I've scoured all the stores—there's no 'khlorofos' insecticide or any other substance anywhere. In another 2 days or so the Colorado beetle larva will have destroyed our entire potato plot."

I also tried to telephone stores trading in household goods. I received just one answer: We cannot suggest anything.

People at the oblast trade administration said: It has been withdrawn from production at the demand of the USSR Ministry of Health; the manufacture of the compound "Kvark" has been organized instead, but at present it is being received in limited quantities. We will make the "Khoztorg" base the target of delivering a little more "Kvark."

Thus everything hinges on the base and the efficiency of its workers. There is every indication that people there did not care about the inhabitants of the oblast who have truck gardens. Everyone is combating the beetle as best they can. But unsuccessfully at present. [Passage omitted]

Scientific

'Nadezhda' Satellite Launched 4 Jul

LD0507081189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0745 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jul (TASS)—A "Nadezhda" artificial earth satellite was launched in the USSR by means of a "Cosmos" carrier rocket on Tuesday [4 July]. It carries apparatus of a navigation system for determining the location of ships of the USSR merchant navy and fishing fleet, and also apparatus for work in the composition of the international space system for search and rescue of ships and aircraft in distress (KOSPAS-SARSAT).

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters:
initial period of revolution, 104.9 minutes;
apogee, 1,026 km;

perigee, 979 km;
orbital inclination, 83 degrees.

The apparatus installed on the satellite is working normally.

Steps Taken To Coordinate Chernobyl Research

PM0507131789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[L. Kaybysheva report: "Science Will Help Chernobyl"]

[Text] Kiev Oblast—About 70 scientific organizations are currently working on the 30-km zone in Chernobylskiy Rayon.

That there are so many of them means that certain research projects have duplicated each other and have failed to add anything substantially new. V. Senin, deputy chief engineer of the "Kombinat" Production Association, talked about the association's large-scale program—the creation of a scientific research coordinating center. A program for cooperation between Soviet organizations and foreign firms on radiation and associated issues—including monitoring of the environment, movements of radionuclides across land and water surfaces, migration in the soil, and the influence of radiation on the biosubstrates, flora, and fauna has already been elaborated. The scientific research department at "Kombinat" has started systematizing research projects on a computer. Foreign specialists are very interested in obtaining this information. In the future it is planned to set up an international scientific center at Chernobyl.

But many scientific research projects started back in May 1986. The "Kombinat" radiation monitoring administration alone has been monitoring the condition of soil-surface water, the air, underground and subsoil water, and buried radioactive material. We can already confidently talk about a sharp if uneven decline in levels of radioactivity. The highest pollution levels are now produced by cesium and ruthenium isotopes. The element most likely to migrate [naiboleye migriruyushchiy element] is strontium-90. Fortunately, the number of radionuclides in the water is below permitted safety levels.

Scientific research work on the entire range of problems will now be conducted by 10 permanent comprehensive expeditions along with 10-15 temporary groups representing 106 scientific research institutes. One of the avenues of the scientific work will be the search for chemical and biological preparations that promote the intensive excretion of characteristic radionuclides from the human body. It is planned to spend R100 million on all the research work in the next few years. The "Resurrection" temporary scientific and technical complex is also being set up. Its task is to set up a data base and a computer-aided design system.